arXiv:1201.3295v1 [math-ph] 16 Jan 2012

Endomorphisms and automorphisms of locally covariant quantum field theories

Christopher J Fewster[*]
Department of Mathematics, University of York,
Heslington, York YO10 5DD, U.K.

January 17, 2012

Abstract

In the framework of locally covariant quantum field theory, a theory is described as a functor from a category of spacetimes to a category of $*$-algebras. It is proposed that the global gauge group of such a theory can be identified as the group of automorphisms of the defining functor. Consequently, multiplets of fields may be identified at the functorial level. It is shown that locally covariant theories that obey standard assumptions in Minkowski space, including energy compactness, have no proper endomorphisms (i.e., all endomorphisms are automorphisms) and have a compact automorphism group. Further, it is shown how the endomorphisms and automorphisms of a locally covariant theory may, in principle, be classified in any single spacetime. As an example, the endomorphisms and automorphisms of a system of finitely many free scalar fields are completely classified.

1 Introduction

Algebraic quantum field theory has been highly successful in analysing the structural properties of general quantum field theories in Minkowski space [26]. For many years, however, rigorous quantum field theory in curved spacetimes was restricted to particular free models, or to spacetimes of maximal symmetry. This situation has changed, following the introduction, by Brunetti, Fredenhagen and Verch (henceforth abbreviated as BFV) of a framework of locally covariant quantum field theory [3]. This framework, in which a quantum field theory is defined as a functor between a category of spacetimes and a category of $(C)^*$-algebras, developed from a formulation given in Verch's proof of a general spin–statistics connection [34] and has subsequently played an important role in the completion of the perturbative construction of interacting theories in curved spacetime [2, 28, 29], a

---

[*] `chris.fewster@york.ac.uk`

Reeh–Schlieder theorem [31], and an analysis of superselection sectors [4, 5]. It has also proved possible to begin an analysis of the fundamental question of what it is that makes a theory of physics the same in different spacetimes [23, 24] (see also [20] for a short summary). In addition, more quantitative applications have been made to particular models in the context of the Casimir effect and quantum energy inequalities [22, 19, 21] and to cosmology [12, 13, 35].

One of the major successes of AQFT in flat spacetime is undoubtedly the Doplicher–Haag–Roberts analysis of superselection sectors and the reconstruction of the field algebra and gauge group from the algebra of observables in the vacuum sector [15, 16, 18]. Brunetti and Ruzzi [4] have employed ideas of local covariance in order to develop a parallel analysis in curved spacetime. One could characterize their approach as being 'bottom-up', as the analysis is performed in each spacetime and questions of covariance are then addressed. It is worth understanding to what extent a 'top-down' analysis is possible, starting from the functorial level. With this eventual aim in mind, the present paper begins by discussing how the global gauge group of a locally covariant theory may be identified in terms of the functor. Our proposal is very simple: the global gauge group may be identified as the group of automorphisms of the functor defining the theory.

To explain this statement, we recall that a natural transformation between functors describing two theories $\zeta : \mathscr{A} \stackrel{.}{\to} \mathscr{B}$ is interpreted as an embedding of theory $\mathscr{A}$ as a subtheory of $\mathscr{B}$. Thus an endomorphism of $\mathscr{A}$ is a way of embedding $\mathscr{A}$ as a subtheory of itself, and an automorphism is a means of doing this in an isomorphic way. The automorphisms have an obvious group structure under composition, which it is very natural to interpret as the global gauge group.[1]

This interpretation is supported by a comparison with the Minkowski space DHR analysis [15]. There, the (maximal) global gauge group consists of (all) unitaries on the Hilbert space of the vacuum representation of the field algebra that commute with the action of the proper orthochronous Poincaré transformations, map each local field algebra isomorphically to itself and preserve the vacuum state. As we show in Sec. 3.1, these properties are respected, and generalized, by the approach we take. To a large extent they hold in a representation-independent sense in arbitrary spacetimes, and they hold in exactly the DHR sense in representations induced by gauge-invariant states, with the Poincaré group replaced by the bijective spacetime isometries preserving (time-)orientation. In particular, the unitary implementation of the automorphism group in the Minkowski vacuum representation is a subgroup of the maximal DHR group – a key open question is to understand whether these groups are equal. We also describe how the gauge group acts on an abstract algebra of fields introduced in [19] and allows the definition of multiplets of fields at the functorial level. In addition, by taking fixed-points under the action of the gauge group, one can define a new locally covariant theory that is a candidate for the description of the observables of the theory. This is not completely satisfactory, because it can happen that there are no nontrivial fixed points (as occurs with the Weyl algebra if the gauge group is continuous, for example); an approach that generates the observables in suitable representations would be preferred, but is not pursued here.

---

[1] There are circumstances where one might wish only to adopt only a subgroup of the automorphisms as the group of internal symmetries; for example, if the theory is studied as an approximation to a more detailed theory. For example, the Lagrangian of electromagnetism is invariant under negation of the vector potential, but this symmetry is typically broken if one includes interactions with matter.

More generally, we will consider the endomorphisms of locally covariant theories, which are interpreted as embeddings of a theory as a subtheory of itself. Some theories admit proper endomorphisms, i.e., endomorphisms that are not automorphisms. For example, the infinite tensor product $\bigotimes_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathscr{F}$ of any nontrivial theory $\mathscr{F}$ admits a proper endomorphism with components $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}}A = \mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}\otimes A$. It seems reasonable to regard this as unphysical behaviour, and we address this issue in Sect. 4 for theories described using C^*-algebras (to be thought of as field algebras) with a suitable state space and which obey a number of standard conditions in Minkowski space, most notably a mild energy compactness assumption. Under these assumptions, we show that any endomorphism of the theory is unitarily implemented in the Poincaré invariant Minkowski representation by an element of the maximal gauge global group in the DHR sense [15]. Therefore, assuming that there are no 'accidental' gauge symmetries in Minkowski space, every endomorphism is an automorphism. We also give a direct proof that the automorphism group is compact; see [15, 17] for proofs in Minkowski space under different hypotheses.

We may draw some interesting parallels with set theory. A set is finite precisely when there there is no injection from it into itself that is not a bijection; a notion of finiteness ascribed to Dedekind. Transporting this idea to other categories, an object is *Dedekind finite* if it has no monic proper endomorphisms (for example, finite-dimensional vector spaces). Our result may be paraphrased as indicating that energy compactness, together with our other assumptions, implies Dedekind finiteness in this sense for locally covariant QFTs. An immediate consequence is a strong analogue of the Cantor–Schröder–Bernstein theorem: if $\mathscr{A}\stackrel{.}{\to}\mathscr{B}$ and $\mathscr{B}\stackrel{.}{\to}\mathscr{A}$ are subtheory embeddings, and at least one of these theories obeys our conditions, then both subtheory embeddings are in fact isomorphisms. In particular, if there is any subtheory embedding $\mathscr{A}\stackrel{.}{\to}\mathscr{B}$ that is not an isomorphism, then there can be *no* embedding $\mathscr{B}\stackrel{.}{\to}\mathscr{A}$. For example, if $\mathscr{A}$ obeys the conditions then there is no subtheory embedding $\mathscr{A}\otimes\mathscr{B}\stackrel{.}{\to}\mathscr{A}$ unless $\mathscr{B}$ is trivial. This is of interest because, in any given spacetime and for specific theories, one can often concoct unital $*$-monomorphisms $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})\otimes\mathscr{B}(\boldsymbol{M})\to\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ (cf. the well-known isomorphism of all separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces); our argument proves that there is no way of doing so in each spacetime so as to form a natural transformation.

In Sect. 5 we show how the gauge group may be computed for a system of finitely many scalar fields with any given mass spectrum, both as a classical theory and as a quantum field theory. As one might expect, gauge transformations preserve sectors with different mass. Within each given mass sector, the gauge transformations act by orthogonal transformations among the different fields with the same mass; in the massless quantized case this is augmented by the freedom to add multiples of the unit element of the algebra, resulting in a noncompact gauge group. This corresponds to the broken symmetry of the Lagrangian under addition of a constant. In both the classical and quantized cases, there are no proper endomorphisms; in the quantized case there is a side condition that we restrict to endomorphisms preserving the class of states with distributional n-point functions. The algebra of observables is also computed in the quantum case.

Open questions and directions resulting from these results include the 'top-down' analysis of superselection sectors mentioned above, and the possible extension of results on classification of subsystems [10, 9] to curved spacetime. A key question is to understand whether (or under what conditions) there are no accidental symmetries in Minkowski space, i.e., that the maximal DHR gauge group coincides with the functorial definition. Finally we mention, as a related work, a paper of Ciolli, Ruzzi and Vasselli [11] that constructs a rather general covariant theory with given symmetry group, from which it is hoped (and proved in some cases) that theories of interest can be obtained as specific representations and which may even provide hints towards the inclusion of local gauge transformations.

2 General framework

2.1 Locally covariant theories

We begin with a brief summary of the main ideas in the BFV framework, as refined in [23], to which the reader is referred for more detail. The category Loc has, as objects, quadruples of the form $\boldsymbol{M} = (\mathcal{M}, \boldsymbol{g}, \mathfrak{o}, \mathfrak{t})$, where $(\mathcal{M}, \boldsymbol{g})$ is a nonempty smooth paracompact globally hyperbolic Lorentzian spacetime of dimension n with at most finitely many connected components and $\mathfrak{o}$ and $\mathfrak{t}$ represent choices of orientation and time-orientation. The spacetime dimension $n \geq 2$ is fixed and the signature convention is $+ - \cdots -$. Morphisms in Loc are smooth isometric embeddings, preserving orientation and time-orientation, with causally convex image (i.e., containing all causal curves whose endpoints it contains); our notation will not distinguish the morphism from its underlying map of manifolds. Note that causal convexity requires, in particular, that disjoint components of the image are causally disjoint. The connected spacetimes form a full subcategory of Loc, denoted Loc_0.

Locally covariant theories can be described as covariant functors from Loc (or Loc_0) to a suitable category Phys of physical systems. Thus, to each $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$ there is an object $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ of Phys, and to each morphism $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$ of Loc there is a morphism $\mathscr{A}(\psi)$ of Phys; we require $\mathscr{A}(\psi \circ \varphi) = \mathscr{A}(\psi) \circ \mathscr{A}(\varphi)$ for all composable ψ, φ, and $\mathscr{A}(\mathrm{id}_{\boldsymbol{M}}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})}$ for each $\boldsymbol{M}$. BFV mainly studied the case where Phys is the category Alg of unital $*$-algebras, with unit-preserving $*$-monomorphisms as the morphisms, and its full subcategory $\mathsf{C^*\text{-}Alg}$ of C^*-algebras. We can cover either eventuality by considering functors $\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Alg}$, saying that such a functor has the *C^*-property* if every $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is in fact a C^*-algebra. When discussing classical fields, we will employ categories of (pre)symplectic spaces, but for the moment we stay with the algebraic setting.

The BFV definition of a locally covariant theory provides a natural description of the local physics associated with any open causally convex subset O of $\boldsymbol{M}$ with finitely many connected components—the set of all such sets being denoted $\mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M})$. Namely, with $\boldsymbol{M}|_O$ defined to be the set O equipped with the metric and (time)-orientation induced from $\boldsymbol{M}$ and regarded as a spacetime in its own right, let $\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O} : \boldsymbol{M}|_O \to \boldsymbol{M}$ be the canonical inclusion morphism. Then we may define $\mathscr{A}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; O)$ to be the image of the map $\mathscr{A}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O})$.

(There are other ways of defining local physics, for example, the dynamics-based approach introduced in [23] – note that in that reference $\mathscr{A}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M};O)$ was taken to be the domain of $\mathscr{A}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O})$, rather than its image.)

The functors from Loc to Alg form the objects of the category of locally covariant theories, LCT, introduced in [23]. The morphisms in this category are natural transformations $\zeta : \mathscr{A} \stackrel{.}{\to} \mathscr{B}$: that is, to each $\boldsymbol{M}$ there is a morphism $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}} : \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M}) \to \mathscr{B}(\boldsymbol{M})$, so that the equality $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) = \mathscr{B}(\psi) \circ \zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ holds for every morphism $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$. The interpretation is that ζ embeds $\mathscr{A}$ as a subtheory of $\mathscr{B}$; in particular, an endomorphism of $\mathscr{A}$ is an embedding of $\mathscr{A}$ as a subtheory of itself.

By a *state space* for an algebra $\mathcal{A}$, we mean a subset $\mathcal{S}$ of normalized positive linear functionals on $\mathcal{A}$ that is closed under convex linear combinations, and operations induced by $\mathcal{A}$ [i.e., to each $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\omega(B^*B) > 0$, the state $\omega_B(A) := \omega(B^*AB)/\omega(B^*B)$ is also an element of $\mathcal{S}$]. BFV raised this idea to the functorial level: along with a functor $\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Alg}$, they consider a contravariant state space functor $\mathscr{S}$ from Loc to a suitable category of state spaces, with the property that each $\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is a state space for $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and that each $\mathscr{S}(\psi)$ is an appropriate restriction of the dual map $\mathscr{A}(\psi)^*$. The state space may be given various additional attributes [3]; in particular, we say that $\mathscr{S}$ is *faithful* if

$$\bigcap_{\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})} \ker \pi_\omega = \{0\},$$

where π_ω is the GNS representation of $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ induced by ω. Given the other properties of a state space, faithfulness also implies[2] that

$$\bigcap_{\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})} \ker \omega = \{0\}.$$

It will be convenient to consider a more general category, whose objects specify an algebra together with a choice of state space, and a grading that can be used to specify Bose/Fermi statistics. Consider the class of triples $\langle \mathcal{A}, \gamma, \mathcal{S} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{A} \in \mathsf{Alg}$, γ is an involutive automorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is a state space for $\mathcal{A}$ obeying $\gamma^*\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}$. A morphism between triples $\langle \mathcal{A}, \gamma, \mathcal{S} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{B}, \delta, \mathcal{T} \rangle$ is determined by any $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ in Alg with the property that $\alpha \circ \gamma = \delta \circ \alpha$ and $\alpha^*\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{S}$.[3] With these definitions we obtain a category xAlg of $\mathbb{Z}^2$-graded algebras with state spaces (with the 'x' suggesting 'extended'), which has an obvious faithful forgetful functor to Alg.

Functors from Loc to xAlg can be regarded as triples $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle$ where $\mathscr{A}$ is a functor $\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Alg}$, $\gamma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{A})$ with $\gamma^2 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\mathscr{S}$ is a state space in the BFV sense for $\mathscr{A}$ that is, additionally, invariant under γ. Using γ, we may define the graded commutator

$$[\![A, B]\!] = AB - (-1)^{\sigma\sigma'} BA$$

---

[2] If $\omega(A) = 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ then also $\omega(B^*AB) = 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and $B \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$; polarising, $\omega(B^*AC) = 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and $B, C \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$, so $\pi_\omega(A) = 0$ for every $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$.

[3] In category theory, the sets of morphisms between distinct pairs of objects should be disjoint. Thus we distinguish morphisms between distinct pairs of triples even where they have the same underlying Alg morphism. We will not make this distinction explicit in the notation, however.

holding if $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(A) = (-1)^\sigma A$, $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(B) = (-1)^{\sigma'} B$ ($\sigma, \sigma' \in \{0,1\}$), and extended by linearity. A theory $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle$ will be said to obey *twisted locality* if

$$[\![\mathscr{A}^{\text{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; O_1), \mathscr{A}^{\text{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; O_2)]\!] = \{0\}$$

whenever $O_i \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M})$ are causally disjoint. Evidently, this reduces to commutation at spacelike separation if $\gamma = \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{A}}$.

Subtheory embeddings in this context are natural transformations between $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{B}, \delta, \mathscr{T} \rangle$; they are determined by natural transformations $\zeta : \mathscr{A} \stackrel{.}{\to} \mathscr{B}$ such that $\zeta \circ \gamma = \delta \circ \zeta$ and $\zeta^* \mathscr{T}$ is a subfunctor of $\mathscr{S}$.[4] (An analogous comment on the notation to that made about xAlg applies here.) In this way we obtain a category xLCT.

An important aspect of the BFV framework is that dynamics is incorporated in a very natural way. A morphism $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$ whose image contains a Cauchy surface for $\boldsymbol{N}$ is described as *Cauchy*; a theory $\mathscr{T} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Phys}$ satisfies the *timeslice axiom* if $\mathscr{T}$ maps Cauchy morphisms to isomorphisms in Phys. If $\boldsymbol{M} = (\mathcal{M}, \boldsymbol{g}, \mathfrak{o}, \mathfrak{t})$, then to every smooth metric perturbation $\boldsymbol{h}$ of compact support for which $\boldsymbol{M}[\boldsymbol{h}] = (\mathcal{M}, \boldsymbol{g} + \boldsymbol{h}, \mathfrak{o}, \mathfrak{t}_{\boldsymbol{h}})$ is also globally hyperbolic (where $\mathfrak{t}_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ agrees with $\mathfrak{t}$ outside the support of $\boldsymbol{h}$) there is an automorphism $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]$ of $\mathscr{T}(\boldsymbol{M})$, called the *relative Cauchy evolution*, that compares the dynamics in $\boldsymbol{M}$ with that in $\boldsymbol{M}[\boldsymbol{h}]$. Thus, in the case $\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Phys} = \mathsf{Alg}$, the relative Cauchy evolution is an automorphism of $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$; for $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{xAlg}$, the relative Cauchy evolution is induced by an automorphism $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]$ of $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ with the additional conditions that $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] \circ \gamma_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \gamma_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]$ and $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]^* \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}) = \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$. The details of the construction can be found in BFV and (slightly reformulated) [23], where it was also shown that the relative Cauchy evolution interacts nicely with subtheory embeddings. In particular, if $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$, Prop. 3.8 in [23] entails that

$$\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] \tag{1}$$

in every spacetime $\boldsymbol{M}$ and for all permitted metric perturbations $\boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M})$. The physical significance of this relationship can be understood more clearly in circumstances where the relative Cauchy evolution can be functionally differentiated with respect to $\boldsymbol{h}$, yielding an object that can be interpreted as the stress-energy tensor (the precise nature of this interpretation depends to an extent on the category Phys). For example, consider a theory $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{xAlg}$, with $\mathscr{S}$ assumed faithful, and suppose that the relative Cauchy evolution is weakly differentiable with respect to $\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ on all $A \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$, i.e., with A, $\boldsymbol{h}(\lambda)$, $\boldsymbol{f}$ as above, there exists a (unique, due to faithfulness) element, denoted $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\boldsymbol{f}), A] \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that

$$\omega([\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\boldsymbol{f}), A]) = 2i \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda} \omega(\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}(\lambda)] A) \right|_{\lambda=0}$$

for all $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$. For any $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle)$, we may differentiate the identity $\omega(\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} A) = \omega(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] A) = (\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}^* \omega)(\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] A)$ and again use faithfulness of $\mathscr{S}$ to obtain

$$[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\boldsymbol{f}), \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} A] = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} [\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\boldsymbol{f}), A] \qquad \forall A \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M}).$$

---

[4] That is, $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}}^*(\mathscr{T}(\boldsymbol{M})) \subset \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$, and $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}}^* \mathscr{T}(\psi)$ is a restriction of $\mathscr{S}(\psi)$ for all $\boldsymbol{M}$, ψ.

Arguments of this type will play an important role in our classification of the endomorphisms and automorphisms of locally covariant theories in later sections. With that end in view, it is also useful to isolate the following observation.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose* $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$*, where* $\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Alg}$*. If* $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\boldsymbol{M})$ *and* ω *is an* $\mathscr{A}(\psi)$*-invariant state on* $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ *then* $\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}}\omega$ *is also invariant.*

Proof: $\mathscr{A}(\psi)^*(\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}}\omega) = \omega \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) = \omega \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \omega \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}}\omega$. □

2.2 Determination of endomorphisms from a single component

We now show how the classification of endomorphisms and automorphisms of a locally covariant theory may be reduced to a problem in any single spacetime. Throughout, we consider a theory $\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Phys}$, where all morphisms of Phys are assumed to be monic. We assume that there is a faithful functor[5] $\mathscr{U} : \mathsf{Phys} \to \mathsf{Phys}'$, where Phys' is a category also with purely monic morphisms, and which also has arbitrary categorical unions (see [14] or Appx B of [23] for the main properties). This is true in particular if Phys itself has unions, by taking $\mathscr{U}$ to be the identity functor; however, it will be convenient to consider more general categories where the existence of unions would either be tedious to demonstrate or even fails. For example, the category of complexified symplectic spaces Sympl does not have unions, but the category of complexified presymplectic spaces $\mathsf{preSympl}$ does. On the other hand, we expect that the category xAlg can be given a union structure, but requires work to demonstrate; for our current purposes, it will be enough that there is the forgetful functor $\mathsf{xAlg} \to \mathsf{Alg}$ is faithful, because the algebraic span is a categorical union in Alg.

Our aim is to show that any $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$ is uniquely determined by any single component $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ in a spacetime $\boldsymbol{M}$. This is accomplished by some simple lemmas, in conjunction with general properties of Loc proved in [23]. The additional assumptions on $\mathscr{A}$ needed are introduced below.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose* $\eta, \eta' \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$ *and that* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ *for some spacetime* $\boldsymbol{M}$*. Assuming that* $\mathscr{A}$ *obeys the timeslice property, then: (i) if* $\boldsymbol{L} \xrightarrow{\psi} \boldsymbol{M}$ *then* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{L}}$*; (ii) if* $\boldsymbol{M} \xrightarrow{\varphi} \boldsymbol{N}$ *is Cauchy then* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{N}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{N}}$*.*

Proof: (i) Because η and η' are natural, we have $\mathscr{A}(\psi) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) = \mathscr{A}(\psi) \circ \eta'_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ and since $\mathscr{A}(\psi)$ is monic, $\eta_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{L}}$. (The time slice property is not required for this argument.) (ii) As $\mathscr{A}(\varphi)$ is an isomorphism, we have $\eta'_{\boldsymbol{N}} = \mathscr{A}(\varphi) \circ \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\varphi)^{-1} = \mathscr{A}(\varphi) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\varphi)^{-1} = \eta_{\boldsymbol{N}}$ as required. □

Iterating this result, we see that if $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ then $\eta_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ for any spacetime $\boldsymbol{L}$ connected to $\boldsymbol{M}$ via a diagram of the following type

$$\boldsymbol{L} \to \boldsymbol{L}_1 \overset{c}{\leftarrow} \boldsymbol{L}_2 \to \boldsymbol{L}_3 \overset{c}{\leftarrow} \boldsymbol{L}_4 \to \cdots \overset{c}{\leftarrow} \boldsymbol{L}_{2k} \to \boldsymbol{M}, \tag{2}$$

where a $\overset{c}{\leftarrow}$ denotes a Cauchy morphism. In particular:

---

[5] That is, $\mathscr{U}$ is injective as a map of morphisms.

Corollary 2.3 *Under the hypotheses of Lem. 2.2, we have* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ *for any spacetime* $\boldsymbol{L}$ *whose Cauchy surfaces are oriented-diffeomorphic to those of* $\boldsymbol{M}|_O$ *for some* $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M})$. *In particular,* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{D}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{D}}$ *for every truncated multi-diamond spacetime* $\boldsymbol{D}$.

Proof: Using the "Cauchy wedge connectedness" result in [23, Prop. 2.4], there is a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} \boldsymbol{L} & \boldsymbol{L}' \arrow[l, "c"'] \arrow[r, "c"] & \boldsymbol{L}'' & \boldsymbol{L}''' \arrow[l, "c"'] \arrow[r, "c"] & \boldsymbol{M}|_O \arrow[r, "\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O}"] & \boldsymbol{M}, \end{tikzcd}$$

which is the special case of (2) in which the left-most morphism is an identity and all but the right-most morphism are Cauchy. Thus $\eta_{\boldsymbol{L}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{L}}$. The particular case holds as every truncated multi-diamond spacetime has Cauchy surfaces oriented-diffeomorphic to those of any truncated multi-diamond region of $\boldsymbol{M}$ with the same number of components. □

Lemma 2.4 *Suppose* $\eta, \eta' \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$. *If* $\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ *is generated by a collection of subobjects* $(\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{A})(\psi_i) : (\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{A})(\boldsymbol{M}_i) \to (\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{A})(\boldsymbol{M})$ $(i \in I)$ *such that* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_i} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}$ *for each* $i \in I$, *then* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}}$.

Proof: We start with the special case in which Phys has unions and $\mathscr{U}$ is the identity functor on Phys. This is essentially obvious, but a formal proof can be given as follows. Given that $\bigvee_{i \in I} \mathscr{A}(\psi_i) \cong \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})}$, the universal property of the union entails that there are unique morphisms α and α' in Phys′ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{A}(\psi_i) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_i} &= \alpha \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi_i) \\ \mathscr{A}(\psi_i) \circ \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}_i} &= \alpha' \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi_i) \end{aligned}$$

for all $i \in I$. But since $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_i} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}$ for all $i \in I$, this implies that $\alpha = \alpha'$; moreover, by the naturality of η and η', it is clear that $\alpha = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $\alpha' = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. In the general case, we note that if $\eta, \eta' \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$ then $\mathscr{U}(\eta), \mathscr{U}(\eta') \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{A})$ and the foregoing argument gives $\mathscr{U}(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}) = \mathscr{U}(\eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}})$. Thus $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ because $\mathscr{U}$ is faithful. □

We shall be interested in theories which are additive with respect to a class of subspacetimes called *truncated multi-diamonds*, which are sets of the form $\mathcal{N} \cap D_{\boldsymbol{M}}(B)$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is an open globally hyperbolic neighbourhood of a Cauchy surface Σ for $\boldsymbol{M}$, and B is a union of finitely many disjoint subsets of Σ each of which is an open ball in suitable local coordinates – see Def. 2.5 of [23] for details. By this, we mean that each $\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is generated over the subobjects obtained from embedding truncated multi-diamonds in $\boldsymbol{M}$. In particular, this applies to the dynamically local theories (see [23, Thm 6.3]).

Theorem 2.5 *If* $\mathscr{A}$ *is additive with respect to truncated multi-diamonds and obeys the timeslice axiom then every* $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$ *is uniquely determined by its component* $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ *in any given spacetime* $\boldsymbol{M}$.

Proof: Suppose $\eta' \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{A})$ agrees with η in $\boldsymbol{M}$, i.e., $\eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Given any spacetime $\boldsymbol{M}'$, $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M}')$ is generated by a collection $(\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M}_i \overset{\psi_i}{\to} \boldsymbol{M}'))_{i \in I}$ with each $\boldsymbol{M}_i$ a truncated multi-diamond, for which we have $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_i} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}_i}$ by Cor. 2.3. Hence by Lem. 2.4, $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}'} = \eta'_{\boldsymbol{M}'}$. As $\boldsymbol{M}'$ was arbitrary, it follows that $\eta = \eta'$. □

3 The gauge group and algebra of observables

3.1 Gauge group

In this section we justify the identification of the automorphism group of a functor as a global gauge group for the corresponding theory, and determine a number of its basic properties. In particular, we will show that we have generalizations of the defining properties of a global gauge group in Minkowski space AQFT [15]: namely, the preservation of local algebras and commutation with the action of spacetime isometries, at the algebraic level, and the existence of a faithful strongly continuous unitary representation in suitable GNS representations.

The simplest observation is that if $\mathscr{F} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Alg}$ and $\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$, then each component $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ restricts to an isomorphism of each local algebra $\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; O)$, ($O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M})$, $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$). Recalling that $\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; O)$ is identified with the image of $\mathscr{F}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O})$, this is an immediate consequence of the naturality equation $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{F}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O}) = \mathscr{F}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};O}) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}|_O}$ together with invertibility of $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}|_O}$.

More generally, we may consider a theory $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{xAlg}$. Recall that an automorphism in this setting is induced by any $\zeta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$ such that $\zeta \circ \gamma = \gamma \circ \zeta$ and $\zeta^* \mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}$. Thus it may be that $\mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ is a proper subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$. If, however, γ is central in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$ we may arrange that these automorphism groups are isomorphic, if necessary by replacing $\mathscr{S}$ by $\widetilde{\mathscr{S}}$, defined so that

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{S}}(\boldsymbol{M}) = \mathrm{co} \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})} \eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}} \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}),$$

where co denotes closure under (finite) convex linear combinations. It is easily seen that $\widetilde{\mathscr{S}}$ has all the properties of a state space functor for $\mathscr{F}$ and is invariant under the gauge group.

Next, given $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{xAlg}$, we may endow the group $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ with the weakest group topology in which $G \ni \eta \mapsto \omega(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F)$ is continuous for all $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$, $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and $F \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$. For the remainder of this subsection, we assume that $\mathscr{F}$ obeys the timeslice axiom and additivity with respect to truncated multi-diamonds.

Proposition 3.1 *If $\mathscr{S}$ is faithful then the topology of G is Hausdorff (and therefore finer than the indiscrete topology provided G is nontrivial). Moreover, if G admits any group topology in which it is compact, it is compact with respect to the above topology.*

Proof: Suppose without loss that G is nontrivial and let $\eta \in G \setminus \{\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{F}}\}$ be arbitrary. Thm 2.5 entails that $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \neq \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}$, so there exists $F \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F \neq F$. As $\mathscr{S}$ is faithful, there is $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that $\omega(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F) \neq \omega(F)$. Thus the topology separates η and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{F}}$ and is therefore Hausdorff. The remaining statements follow immediately. □

Proposition 3.2 *Suppose $\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is gauge-invariant, i.e., $\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}} \omega = \omega$ for all $\eta \in G$, and induces a faithful GNS representation $(\mathcal{H}_\omega, \mathscr{D}_\omega, \pi_\omega, \Omega_\omega)$ of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$. Then there is* *a faithful and strongly continuous representation $G \ni \eta \mapsto U_\eta$ such that $\pi_\omega(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F) = U_\eta \pi_\omega(F) U_\eta^{-1}$ and $U_\eta \Omega_\omega = \Omega_\omega$ ($\eta \in G$, $F \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$). Moreover, if π_ω is irreducible, the representation of G commutes with the unitary representation of any spacetime automorphism under which ω is invariant.*

Proof: The existence of the unitary representation is immediate from gauge-invariance of ω. If $U_\eta = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_\omega}$, then $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F = F$ for all $F \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$, because π_ω is faithful. Thus η and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{F}}$ have equal components in $\boldsymbol{M}$ and are therefore equal by Thm 2.5, so $\eta \mapsto U_\eta$ is faithful. The definition of the topology of G and closure of the state space under operations imply that the maps $\eta \mapsto \omega((A + \lambda \mathbf{1})^* (\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} B)(A + \lambda \mathbf{1}))$ are continuous for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $A, B \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$. Expanding, and considering the cases $\lambda = 0$, $\lambda = \pm i$, we deduce that the maps $\eta \mapsto \omega(A^* \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} B)$ and $\eta \mapsto \omega((\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} B) A)$ are continuous for any $A, B \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$. It is then easily seen that $\eta \mapsto U_\eta$ is strongly continuous on the dense domain $\pi_\omega(\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}))\Omega_\omega$; as this domain is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\omega$, an $\epsilon/3$ argument demonstrates strong continuity.

Now let H be the (possibly trivial) subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\boldsymbol{M})$ leaving ω invariant, i.e., $\mathscr{A}(\psi)^* \omega = \omega$ for all $\psi \in H$. Then there is also a unitary representation $H \ni \psi \mapsto V_\psi$, with $\pi_\omega(\mathscr{F}(\psi) F) = V_\psi \pi_\omega(F) V_\psi^{-1}$ and $V_\psi \Omega_\omega = \Omega_\omega$ ($\psi \in H$, $F \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$). The computation

$$U_\eta V_\psi \pi_\omega(F) V_\psi^* U_\eta^* = \pi_\omega(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{F}(\psi) F) = \pi_\omega(\mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F) = V_\psi U_\eta \pi_\omega(F) U_\eta^* V_\psi^*$$

shows that U_η and V_ψ commute up to phase, by irreducibility of π_ω; as both operators leave Ω_ω invariant, it follow that U_η and V_ψ commute. □

3.2 Action on fields

As we now show, the gauge group of a theory acts in a natural way on the associated locally covariant fields. Some relevant definitions are needed from BFV and [19], adapted slightly to our setting. Let $\mathscr{D} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Set}$ be the functor defined with $\mathscr{D}(\boldsymbol{M}) = C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M})$ (as a set) and $\mathscr{D}(\boldsymbol{M}\ \overset{\psi}{\boldsymbol{N}}) f = \psi_* f$, the push-forward of test functions, defined by

$$(\psi_* f)(p) = \begin{cases} f(\psi^{-1}(p)) & p \in \psi(\boldsymbol{M}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

for $f \in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M})$, $p \in \boldsymbol{N}$. Let $\mathscr{U} : \mathsf{xAlg} \to \mathsf{Set}$ be the forgetful functor sending $\langle \mathcal{A}, \gamma, \mathcal{S} \rangle$ to the underlying set of $\mathcal{A}$. Then a scalar field associated with theory $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{xAlg}$ is defined to be a natural transformation $\Phi : \mathscr{D} \overset{.}{\to} \mathscr{U} \circ \langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle$. That is, to each $\boldsymbol{M}$ there is a function $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}} : C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}) \to \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$, such that

$$\mathscr{F}(\psi) \Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f) = \Phi_{\boldsymbol{N}}(\mathscr{D}(\psi) f) = \Phi_{\boldsymbol{N}}(\psi_* f)$$

for any $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$. The map $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is not assumed to be either linear or injective. Fields indexed by (possibly distributional) sections in more general bundles can also be described in a similar way – see, e.g., [19] – but we will restrict to the scalar case for simplicity.

It was noted in [19] that the set $\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$ of such fields may be given a unital $*$-algebra structure under pointwise operations inherited from the algebras $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$. Thus $(\Phi+\lambda\Psi)_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)+\lambda\Psi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)$, $(\Phi\Psi)_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)\Psi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)$, $(\Phi^*)_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)^*$,[6] and the unit field is $\mathbf{1}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}$, for all $f\in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M})$, $\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathsf{Loc}$. If $\mathscr{F}$ has the C^*-property then

$$\|\Phi\| = \sup_{\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathsf{Loc}}\sup_{f\in\mathscr{D}(\boldsymbol{M})}\|\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)\|_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}$$

is a C^*-norm on the $*$-subalgebra $\mathrm{Fld}^\infty(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$ on which it is finite. (Some set-theoretical niceties are glossed over here; see [19] for the details.)

These abstract algebras of fields carry an action of the automorphism group $G=\mathrm{Aut}(\langle\mathscr{F},\gamma,\mathscr{S}\rangle)$ in an obvious way. Given any automorphism η, and $\Phi\in\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$, define $\eta\cdot\Phi$ by

$$(\eta\cdot\Phi)_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)\qquad(f\in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}),\ \boldsymbol{M}\in\mathsf{Loc}).$$

This is easily seen to define a field $\eta\cdot\Phi\in\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$ by the calculation

$$\mathscr{F}(\psi)(\eta\cdot\Phi)_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\mathscr{F}(\psi)\circ\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f))=\eta_{\boldsymbol{N}}\circ\mathscr{F}(\psi)\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f)=\eta_{\boldsymbol{N}}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{N}}(\psi_*f)=(\eta\cdot\Phi)_{\boldsymbol{N}}(\psi_*f)$$

for any $\psi:\boldsymbol{M}\to\boldsymbol{N}$, $f\in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M})$. Moreover, the action of η is evidently a $*$-automorphism of $\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$ and gives a group homomorphism $G\mapsto\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F}))$ [and a C^*-automorphism of $\mathrm{Fld}^\infty(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$, and corresponding group homomorphism, if relevant].

Endowing $\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$ with the weakest topology in which every function $\Phi\mapsto\omega(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f))$ ($\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathsf{Loc}$, $f\in\mathscr{D}(\boldsymbol{M})$, $\omega\in\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$) is continuous, this action of G is continuous. For $\eta\mapsto\eta\cdot\Phi$ is continuous iff the functions $\eta\mapsto\omega((\eta\cdot\Phi)_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f))=\omega(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f))$ are continuous, which they are by definition of the topology of G.

In particular, this gives a continuous linear representation of G on $\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$, regarded as a vector space. A *multiplet of fields* can now be defined as any subspace of $\mathrm{Fld}(\mathscr{D},\mathscr{F})$ transforming under an indecomposable representation of G, and every field can be associated with an equivalence class of G-representation. Let ρ,σ be the equivalence classes corresponding to fields Φ, Ψ. Then Φ^* transforms in the complex conjugate representation $\bar{\rho}$ to ρ, any linear combination of Φ and Ψ transforms in a subrepresentation of a quotient of $\rho\oplus\sigma$, and $\Phi\Psi$ and $\Psi\Phi$ transform in (possibly different) subrepresentations of quotients of $\rho\otimes\sigma$. The quotients reflect any algebraic relationships among the fields in the multiplets of Φ, Ψ under the linear combination or product. For example, if Φ and Ψ belong to a common multiplet, then their linear combinations belong to the same multiplet.

3.3 The algebra of observables

In AQFT, the local observables are precisely those elements of the local field algebras that are fixed points under the gauge group. An analogous construction may be carried out for any theory $\mathscr{F}:\mathsf{Loc}_0\to\mathsf{Phys}$,[7] provided that Phys has equalizers over arbitrary families of morphisms: in each $\boldsymbol{M}$, let $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ be an equalizer for all the morphisms $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ where $\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$. Thus $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ for all $\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$ and, if some β should have the same property (replacing $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ by β) then $\beta = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \gamma$ for a uniquely determined γ. We write $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ for the domain of $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. Next, if $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$, observe that

---

[6] If Φ is a linear field, this definition makes Φ^* conjugate linear.

[7] For the moment, we restrict to connected spacetimes; see comments below.

$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} \qquad (\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})),$$

so there is a unique morphism $\mathscr{A}(\psi) : \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M}) \to \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{N})$ such that $\mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi)$.

Proposition 3.3 *$\mathscr{A} : \mathsf{Loc}_0 \to \mathsf{Phys}$ is a functor, and the maps $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ constitute a subtheory embedding $\alpha : \mathscr{A} \dot{\to} \mathscr{F}$. Moreover, if $\beta : \mathscr{B} \dot{\to} \mathscr{F}$ is any subtheory embedding such that $\eta \circ \beta = \beta$ for all $\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$, then there is a unique $\hat{\beta} : \mathscr{B} \dot{\to} \mathscr{A}$ so that $\beta = \alpha \circ \hat{\beta}$.*

Proof: The functorial nature of $\mathscr{A}$ is justified by the calculations $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\mathrm{id}_{\boldsymbol{M}}) = \mathscr{F}(\mathrm{id}_{\boldsymbol{M}}) \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and

$$\alpha_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi') = \mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \mathscr{F}(\psi') \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \mathscr{F}(\psi \circ \psi') \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi \circ \psi')$$

together with the monic property of the $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. By construction the $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ constitute a natural $\alpha : \mathscr{A} \dot{\to} \mathscr{F}$, with the property $\eta \circ \alpha = \alpha$ for all $\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$. If $\beta : \mathscr{B} \dot{\to} \mathscr{F}$ with $\eta \circ \beta = \beta$ for all $\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$, we take components in $\boldsymbol{M}$ and use the equalizing property of $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ to deduce that $\beta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \hat{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ for uniquely determined $\hat{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{M}} : \mathscr{B}(\boldsymbol{M}) \to \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$. We then calculate

$$\alpha_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \hat{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{B}(\psi) = \beta_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{B}(\psi) = \mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \beta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \mathscr{F}(\psi) \circ \alpha_{\boldsymbol{M}} \circ \hat{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \alpha_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{A}(\psi) \circ \hat{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{M}},$$

which proves (again, because $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{N}}$ is monic) that $\hat{\beta} : \mathscr{B} \dot{\to} \mathscr{A}$ and $\beta = \alpha \circ \hat{\beta}$. □

The theory $\mathscr{A}$ is a natural candidate for the theory of observables determined by the field functor $\mathscr{F}$. In the case $\mathsf{Phys} = \mathsf{Alg}$, of course, the algebra $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ may be identified concretely with the subalgebra of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ of fixed points under $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ ($\eta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$).

However, there are various reasons to be cautious regarding this definition. First, there is no guarantee that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{A})$ is trivial, although this is what one would expect if $\mathscr{F}$ is a 'reasonable' field functor, and could be used as a selection criterion for candidate field functors $\mathscr{F}$. As an example of an 'unreasonable' field functor, suppose that indeed $\mathscr{F}$ is given so that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{A})$ is trivial, and adopt $\mathscr{F} \otimes \mathscr{A}$ as the field functor. In the simplest case, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F} \otimes \mathscr{A}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}) \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{A}}$, and the corresponding observable functor would be $\mathscr{A} \otimes \mathscr{A}$, which has a nontrivial automorphism corresponding to the interchange of factors. Thus $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{A} \otimes \mathscr{A})$ has a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup.

Second, if one applies the same construction to theories defined on possibly disconnected spacetimes Loc, it can result in 'observables' that are built from 'unobservable' elements in different spacetime components, whose operational significance is unclear, to say the least (we will see examples in Sect. 5). In these circumstances, it is tempting to define the 'true algebra of observables' to be the subalgebra of $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ generated by the images of

$\mathscr{A}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};\boldsymbol{C}})(\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{C}))$ as $\boldsymbol{C}$ runs over the connected components of $\boldsymbol{M}$, with canonical inclusions $\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};\boldsymbol{C}} : \boldsymbol{C} \to \boldsymbol{M}$.

Third, in some cases it can happen that the theory $\mathscr{A}$ is trivial. For example, in the case of the classical fields discussed in Sect. 5 there are no nonzero elements of the symplectic space that are invariant under the action of all elements of the symmetry group. Similar problems occur if the theory is then quantized using the Weyl algebra, which has no fixed points (other than multiples of the unit) under a faithful continuous group action if there are no fixed-points in the underlying symplectic space.

Nonetheless, the above definition is worthy of further investigation and will turn out to give the expected theory of observables in the scalar field examples, when quantized using the infinitesimal Weyl algebra.

4 Energy compactness excludes proper endomorphisms

One might suspect that theories admitting endomorphisms that are not automorphisms are unphysical in some way. In this section, we confirm such suspicions for locally covariant theories whose Minkowski space versions obey standard assumptions of the Haag–Araki–Kastler framework, of which the most important will be an energy compactness requirement weaker than the nuclearity conditions of [8]. Provided such a theory has no 'accidental' gauge symmetries in Minkowski space—internal symmetries of the Minkowski space net that do not arise from automorphisms of the locally covariant theory—then all its endomorphisms are automorphisms. Moreover, we show that the automorphism group can be given the structure of a compact topological group. Our argument here is more direct than standard presentations and uses weaker hypotheses; it is therefore of independent interest.

Energy compactness conditions were first introduced by Haag and Swieca [27] in an attempt to understand the general conditions under which a quantum field theory admits a particle interpretation. A major development in this line of thought occurred with the introduction of nuclearity criteria by Buchholz and Wichmann [8], which gave more stringent criteria closely linked to the split property (itself linked to a rich mathematical theory of standard split inclusions of von Neumann algebras [17]) and good thermodynamic behaviour of the theory [6]. A variety of nuclearity conditions have been proposed subsequently, see [7] for a review and [1] for a more recent variant. The underlying physical idea of all these approaches, arising from the uncertainty principle, is that the number of degrees of freedom available in small phase space volumes should be finite; this cannot be implemented literally, and compactness or its variants often stand in for 'finiteness' in the technical conditions imposed.

Given that endomorphisms of a locally covariant theory are injections and preserve both localization and the energy scale, they intuitively map any given volume of phase space into itself in a volume preserving way. Thus the existence of a proper endomorphism, (i.e., one that is not an automorphism) can be expected to conflict with energy compactness on physical grounds, and this is exactly what we will establish. Note that we are not claiming, nor do we expect, that all models violating energy compactness admit proper endomorphisms.

Our result will be proved for locally covariant theory $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle \in \mathsf{xLCT}$ obeying twisted locality, which additionally obeys a number of standard assumptions in Minkowski space that we now introduce and discuss.

1. *C^* and Additivity* $\mathscr{F}$ has the C^*-property, and is additive with respect to truncated multi-diamonds.
2. *Unique Poincaré invariant state* In Minkowski space $\boldsymbol{M}_0$, there is a unique state $\omega_0 \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ that is $\mathscr{F}(\psi)$-invariant for all proper orthochronous Poincaré transformations ψ.

It should be noted that assumption (2) does not apply in the case of the massless free scalar field, where there is a 1-parameter family of Poincaré invariant vacuum states in Minkowski space. We will see (albeit not in the C^*-setting) that there are no proper endomorphisms of that theory either, but that the automorphism group is noncompact, in contrast to the situation discussed in this section.

The invariant state ω_0 induces a GNS representation $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ of the theory in Minkowski space, which we assume to obey a number of standard conditions:

3. *Faithfulness, irreducibility and separability* The GNS representation π is a faithful and irreducible representation of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.
4. *Covariance and spectrum condition* (a) The algebra automorphisms of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ induced by the proper orthochronous Poincaré group can be unitarily implemented in $(\mathscr{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ by a strongly continuous unitary representation $\Lambda \mapsto U(\Lambda)$ so that $U(\Lambda)\Omega = \Omega$ and

$$U(\Lambda)\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))U(\Lambda)^{-1} = \pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; \Lambda O));$$

   (b) the self-adjoint generators P_μ of the translation subgroup have joint spectrum contained in the forward light-cone.
5. *Reeh–Schlieder* For each $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, the subspace $\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))\Omega$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$.
6. *Twisted duality* The net of von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{M}(O) := \pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))''$ indexed by relatively compact, connected $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, obeys twisted duality (see below).
7. *Energy compactness* For some $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\beta > 0$, the set

$$\mathcal{N} = \{e^{-\beta H} W\Omega : \ W \in \mathcal{M}(O) \text{ s.t. } W^*W = \mathbf{1}\}$$

   is a relatively compact subset of $\mathcal{H}$ (with necessarily dense linear span, by the Reeh–Schlieder condition and because $e^{-\beta H} = (e^{-\beta H})^*$ has trivial kernel), where $H = P_0$ is the Hamiltonian with respect to some system of inertial coordinates.

These are all standard assumptions and indeed, the crucial assumption on energy compactness is much weaker than the nuclearity condition of [8], which would require $\mathcal{N}$ to be a nuclear subset of $\mathcal{H}$, with nuclearity index obeying prescribed bounds in terms of the size of O and the inverse temperature β. Here, our condition is not required to hold for all β or O and therefore can incorporate some theories with a maximum temperature. The exponential energy damping is not critical. One could work just as well with a spectral projection of H, as in the Haag–Swieca criterion [27]; again, our condition would be weaker, because Haag and Swieca also impose conditions on the 'approximate dimension' of the sets they consider.

Twisted duality is defined as follows [15]. Let Γ be the unitary implementing $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$, so $\Gamma^2 = \mathbf{1}$, $\Gamma\Omega = \Omega$ and $\Gamma\pi(A)\Gamma^{-1} = \pi(\gamma(A))$ for all $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, and define a unitary

$$Z = \frac{1-i}{2} + \frac{1+i}{2}\Gamma.$$

For any subset of bounded operators $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, define $\mathcal{M}^t = Z\mathcal{M}Z^{-1}$ and write $\mathcal{M}^t(O) := \mathcal{M}(O)^t$ for brevity. If $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(B) = (-1)^\sigma B$ ($\sigma = \{0,1\}$) then

$$[\pi(A), Z\pi(B)Z^{-1}] = \pi(\llbracket A, B \rrbracket)(-i\Gamma)^\sigma$$

for any $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, from which the expression for general B may be obtained by linearity. Thus, from twisted locality of $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle$ we deduce that $\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\rm kin}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))$ and $\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\rm kin}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; \tilde{O}))^t$ commute for any spacelike separated $O, \tilde{O} \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, and hence $\mathcal{M}(O) \subset \mathcal{M}^t(\tilde{O})'$. *Twisted duality* is the stronger statement that, for relatively compact connected $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$,

$$\mathcal{M}(O) = \bigcap_{\tilde{O} \subset O'} \mathcal{M}^t(\tilde{O})',$$

where the intersection runs over all relatively compact connected $\tilde{O} \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ contained in the causal complement of O.

Our aim is to show that, subject to the above conditions, any endomorphism $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle)$ is indistinguishable, in Minkowski space, from a gauge transformation of the Minkowski space theory in the sense of Doplicher, Haag and Roberts [15]. In that context, one studies the group $G_{\rm max}$ of all unitary operators U on $\mathcal{H}$ that commute with the representation of the Poincaré group, preserve the vacuum vector and act strictly locally on the net of local von Neumann algebras, in the sense that $U\mathcal{M}(O)U^{-1} = \mathcal{M}(O)$ for all relatively compact connected $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. We will show that $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ is unitarily implemented by an element of $G_{\rm max}$. Actually, one can say more, under an additional assumption.

8. *Implementation of* rce The relative Cauchy evolution can be unitarily implemented in the GNS representation of ω_0, i.e., to each $\boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, there is a unitary $V(\boldsymbol{h})$ on $\mathcal{H}$, such that

$$V(\boldsymbol{h})\pi(A)V(\boldsymbol{h})^{-1} = \pi(\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]A) \qquad (A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})).$$

We assume in addition that $\langle \Omega \mid V(\boldsymbol{h})\Omega \rangle \neq 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$.

Note that $V(\boldsymbol{h})$ cannot leave the vacuum invariant (unless the relative Cauchy evolution is trivial) by Prop. 4.2 below. The assumption that $\langle\Omega \mid V(\boldsymbol{h})\Omega\rangle \neq 0$ is motivated by the idea that $V(\boldsymbol{h})\Omega$ is a 'squeezed' vacuum. This can be seen explicitly for free Bose theories, where the relative Cauchy evolution of the QFT is a Bogoliubov transformation induced by the relative Cauchy evolution in the underlying classical theory. (One might suspect that it actually follows from the other axioms, but we do not have a proof of this at present.) In fact, the assumption should hold generally at least for $\boldsymbol{h}$ in a neighbourhood of the zero test tensor, if the relative Cauchy evolution is assumed to be continuous at $\boldsymbol{h} = \boldsymbol{0}$, which in turn is a precondition for the existence of a stress-energy tensor as a field in the GNS representation of ω_0. The utility of this condition is made clear in the following result.

Lemma 4.1 *Subject to assumptions (1)-(8) above, if* $\zeta \in \mathrm{End}(\langle\mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ *is unitarily implemented in* $(\mathscr{H}, \pi, \Omega)$ *by a unitary operator* U *preserving the vacuum, then* U *commutes with every* $V(\boldsymbol{h})$*,* $\boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$*.*

Proof: For any $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, the intertwining property (1) entails

$$\begin{aligned} UV(\boldsymbol{h})\pi(A)V(\boldsymbol{h})^{-1}U^{-1} &= \pi(\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} \circ \mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]A) = \pi(\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}] \circ \zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}A) \\ &= V(\boldsymbol{h})U\pi(A)U^{-1}V(\boldsymbol{h})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As π is irreducible, this implies that $UV(\boldsymbol{h}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{h})V(\boldsymbol{h})U$, for some constant $\alpha(\boldsymbol{h})$, necessarily of unit modulus. But $U\Omega = \Omega$ and $\langle\Omega \mid V(\boldsymbol{h})\Omega\rangle \neq 0$, so $\alpha(\boldsymbol{h}) = 1$. □

Once the implementation of $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ is known to lie in $G_{\max}$, Lem. 4.1 shows that it necessarily lies in the (possibly smaller) subgroup

$$G_{\mathrm{rce}} = G_{\max} \cap \{V(\boldsymbol{h}) : \boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M}_0)\}',$$

which we will show to be compact in the strong operator topology.

As a minor digression, we also note the following application of Lem. 4.1 (from which the affiliation of the stress-energy tensor to the local net would follow).

Proposition 4.2 *Subject to assumptions (1)-(8) above, if* $\boldsymbol{h} \in H(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O)$ *for relatively compact connected* $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$*, then* $V(\boldsymbol{h}) \in \mathcal{M}(O)$*. Moreover,* $V(\boldsymbol{h})\Omega \in \mathbb{C}\Omega$ *only if* $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]$ *is the identity automorphism.*

Proof: If $\tilde{O} \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ is relatively compact and connected subset of the causal complement $O' = \boldsymbol{M}_0 \backslash \mathrm{cl}\, J_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(O)$ of O, then $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]A = A$ for all $A \in \mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; \tilde{O})$ by Prop. 3.5 of [23], and hence $V(\boldsymbol{h}) \in \pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}; \tilde{O}))' = \mathcal{M}(\tilde{O})'$. Applying Lem. 4.1 to γ, we see that $V(\boldsymbol{h})$ commutes with Γ and hence Z, so we also have $V(\boldsymbol{h}) \in \mathcal{M}^t(\tilde{O})'$. The result $V(\boldsymbol{h}) \in \mathcal{M}(O)$ now follows from twisted duality and arbitrariness of $\tilde{O}$. If $V(\boldsymbol{h})\Omega = \alpha\Omega$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$), then $V(\boldsymbol{h}) = \alpha\mathbf{1}$ as Ω is a separating vector for $\mathcal{M}(O)$ by twisted locality and the Reeh–Schlieder property. As π is faithful, this implies $\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]$ is trivial. □

The assumptions made to this stage will show that the endomorphism η of $\langle\mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$ acts as an *automorphism* of the Minkowski space net. Provided that such automorphisms are all related to symmetries of the full theory, i.e., there are no 'accidental symmetries', we may then conclude that η is an automorphism. Thus, our final assumption is:

9. *Absence of accidental gauge symmetries* To each $U \in G_{\rm rce}$ there is an automorphism $\zeta(U) \in \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ such that $\zeta(U)_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ is unitarily implemented by U in the representation $(\mathcal{H}, \pi, \Omega)$.

It would be interesting to try to remove this assumption, and rather derive it from the other axioms or another more primitive requirement. We leave this as an open problem.

Theorem 4.3 *Under the assumptions (1)–(9) above,*

$$\mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle) = \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle) \cong G_{\rm rce}$$

(an isomorphism of groups). Moreover, $G_{\rm rce}$ is compact in the strong operator topology, from which it follows that $\mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ *is compact in the topology given in Sec. 3.1.*

The proof of this result will occupy the rest of the section. In the category of sets, objects admitting no proper monic endomorphisms are finite (this is Dedekind's definition of finiteness); in the category of vector spaces they are the finite-dimensional spaces. The absence of proper (necessarily monic) endomorphisms here indicates that theories with energy compactness (and the other assumptions) are Dedekind-finite objects in the category of locally covariant theories. [This is *not* to say that the algebras $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ are finite-dimensional, but rather that the functor $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$ has an analogous property to finite objects in other categories. See [32] for other examples of Dedekind finiteness in different categories, including a number of salutary counterexamples.] An immediate consequence is a strong version of the Schröder–Bernstein property for locally covariant theories.

Corollary 4.4 *Suppose $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{B}, \delta, \mathscr{T}\rangle$ are objects of* xLCT. *Suppose there are subtheory embeddings of $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle \stackrel{.}{\to} \langle \mathscr{B}, \delta, \mathscr{T}\rangle$ and $\langle \mathscr{B}, \delta, \mathscr{T}\rangle \stackrel{.}{\to} \langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$. If at least one of the theories obeys assumptions (1)–(9) then the subtheory embeddings mentioned are both isomorphisms.*

Proof: Without loss, suppose that $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$ obeys the assumptions (1)–(9) and write the subtheory embeddings as $\alpha : \langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle \stackrel{.}{\to} \langle \mathscr{B}, \delta, \mathscr{T}\rangle$ and $\beta : \langle \mathscr{B}, \delta, \mathscr{T}\rangle \stackrel{.}{\to} \langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$. Then $\eta = \beta\circ\alpha$ is an endomorphism of $\langle \mathscr{A}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$, and hence an automorphism by Thm 4.3. As β is monic, we may deduce that both β and α are isomorphisms.[8] □
Proof of Thm 4.3: Consider any endomorphism $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$, and abuse notation by writing the underlying endomorphism of $\mathscr{F}$ as η as well. We have $\eta\circ\gamma = \gamma\circ\eta$ and $\eta^*\mathscr{S} \subset \mathscr{S}$. As ω_0 is the unique Poincaré invariant state, Lem. 2.1 entails that $\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\omega_0 = \omega_0$. Then the calculation, for arbitrary $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$,

$$\|\pi(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}A)\Omega\|^2 = \omega_0((\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}A)^*\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(A)) = \omega_0(A^*A) = \|\pi(A)\Omega\|^2$$

shows that

$$T\pi(A)\Omega = \pi(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}A)\Omega \qquad \forall\ A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$$

---

[8] Evidently, $\beta\circ(\alpha\circ\eta^{-1}) = \mathrm{id}_{\langle \mathscr{A},\gamma,\mathscr{S}\rangle}$, and $\beta\circ(\alpha\circ\eta^{-1})\circ\beta = \beta = \beta\circ\mathrm{id}_{\langle \mathscr{B},\delta,\mathscr{T}\rangle}$, entailing that $(\alpha\circ\eta^{-1})\circ\beta = \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{B}}$ using the monic property of β. Hence β is invertible, and so is $\alpha = \beta^{-1}\circ\eta$.

defines T unambiguously on a dense domain in the GNS Hilbert space, and extends by continuity to define an isometry of $\mathcal{H}$ into itself.

Next, let $\tau_t : (x^0, \boldsymbol{x}) \mapsto (x^0 + t, \boldsymbol{x})$ be the time translation automorphism of $\boldsymbol{M}_0$ in some system of standard inertial coordinates, unitarily implemented so that $e^{iHt}\pi(A)\Omega = \pi(\mathscr{F}(\tau_t)A)\Omega$, where H is the Hamiltonian in these coordinates. Because η is natural, we must have $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} \circ \mathscr{F}(\tau_t) = \mathscr{F}(\tau_t) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$, which gives

$$Te^{iHt}\pi(A)\Omega = \pi(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} \circ \mathscr{F}(\tau_t)A)\Omega = \pi(\mathscr{F}(\tau_t) \circ \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}A)\Omega = e^{iHt}T\pi(A)\Omega$$

i.e., the isometry T commutes with e^{iHt} on a dense domain and hence all of $\mathcal{H}$. We deduce that T also commutes with $e^{-\beta H}$ for any $\beta \geq 0$.[9]

For any unital C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, we write $\mathcal{A}_{(1)} = \{A \in \mathcal{A} : \ A^*A = \mathbf{1}\}$. According to the energy compactness assumption, we may choose $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\beta > 0$ so that $\mathcal{N} = e^{-\beta H}\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}_{(1)}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))\Omega$ is a subset of the relatively compact set $e^{-\beta H}\mathcal{M}_{(1)}(O)\Omega$. Hence $\mathcal{N}$ is relatively compact, with dense linear span. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} T\mathcal{N} &= e^{-\beta H}T\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}_{(1)}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))\Omega = e^{-\beta H}\pi(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}_{(1)}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))\Omega \\ &\subset e^{-\beta H}\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}_{(1)}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))\Omega = \mathcal{N}. \end{aligned}$$

The following result entails that T is unitary.

Lemma 4.5 *Suppose $\mathcal{N}$ is a relatively compact subset of $\mathcal{H}$ with dense linear span. If $T \in \mathscr{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is an isometry with $T\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{N}$, then T is unitary, and $T\,\mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof: For any $\psi \in \mathcal{N}$, the sequence $T^k\psi$ is contained in $\mathcal{N}$ and therefore has a subsequence $T^{k_r}\psi$ converging in $\mathcal{H}$. In particular, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $R > 0$ such that $\|(T^{k_s} - T^{k_r})\psi\| < \epsilon$ for all $s > r > R$. But T is an isometry, so we also have $\|T^{k_s - k_r}\psi - \psi\| < \epsilon$ and we may deduce the existence of a sequence $j_r \to \infty$ with $T^{j_r}\psi \to \psi$. Hence $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathrm{cl}(T\mathcal{N})$, which, together with $T\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{N}$, implies $\mathrm{cl}(T\mathcal{N}) = \mathrm{cl}(\mathcal{N})$. Moreover, as $T^{(j_r-1)}\psi = T^*T^{j_r}\psi \to T^*\psi$, we have $\|T^*\psi\| = \lim_r \|T^{j_r-1}\psi\| = \|\psi\|$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{N}$. Now $\mathbf{1} - TT^*$ is a projection, and we have the elementary identity $\|(\mathbf{1} - TT^*)\psi\|^2 = \langle \psi \mid (\mathbf{1} - TT^*)\psi\rangle = \|\psi\|^2 - \|T^*\psi\|^2 = 0$, so $TT^*\psi = \psi$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{N}$. As $\mathcal{N}$ has dense linear span, we conclude that T is unitary. Accordingly a sequence in $\mathscr{H}$ is Cauchy if and only if its image under T is, from which we may obtain $T\,\mathrm{cl}\,\mathcal{N} = \mathrm{cl}\,T\mathcal{N} = \mathrm{cl}\,\mathcal{N}$. $\square$

Given unitarity of T, we can see, by considering the action on the dense domain $T\pi(\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0))\Omega$, that T implements $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$, i.e., $T\pi(A)T^{-1} = \pi(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}A)$. Therefore

$$T\pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))T^{-1} = \pi(\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))) \subset \pi(\mathscr{F}^{\mathrm{kin}}(\boldsymbol{M}_0; O))$$

for all $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. If T^{-1} were known to implement an endomorphism of $\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S}\rangle$ (as would be the case if η was an automorphism) then we could strengthen the above inclusion to equality.[10] In general, however, it seems that we need an additional assumption, such as twisted duality, to proceed.

---

[9] Take any Schwartz test function f with $\hat{f}(\lambda) = e^{-\beta\lambda}$ for $\lambda \geq 0$; then $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t)\langle\varphi \mid e^{-iHt}\psi\rangle dt = \langle\varphi \mid e^{-\beta H}\psi\rangle$ for any $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$, from which $Te^{-\beta H} = e^{-\beta H}T$ follows (cf. the proof of Thm VIII.13 in [30]).

Passing to the local von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{M}(O)$, the argument so far has established that $T\mathcal{M}(O)T^{-1} \subset \mathcal{M}(O)$, for all relatively compact connected $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. As η commutes with γ, we have $T\Gamma = \Gamma T$, and therefore $TZ = ZT$. In particular, $T\mathcal{M}^t(O)T^{-1} = (T\mathcal{M}(O)T^{-1})^t \subset \mathcal{M}^t(O)$. Thus, if $\tilde{O}$ is spacelike to O,

$$[T^{-1}\mathcal{M}(O)T, \mathcal{M}^t(\tilde{O})] = T^{-1}[\mathcal{M}(O), T\mathcal{M}^t(\tilde{O})T^{-1}]T \subset T^{-1}[\mathcal{M}(O), \mathcal{M}^t(\tilde{O})]T = \{0\}$$

and by twisted duality, we see that $T^{-1}\mathcal{M}(O)T \subset \mathcal{M}(O)$. Putting this together with our earlier result gives $T\mathcal{M}(O)T^{-1} = \mathcal{M}(O)$ for all relatively compact connected $O \in \mathscr{O}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$.

As T is now seen to be a unitary operator, commuting with the unitary representation of the proper, orthochronous Poincaré group, acting strictly locally on the net and preserving Ω, it belongs to the maximal gauge group $G_{\max}$ considered in [15]; hence by Lem. 4.1, we have $T \in G_{\rm rce}$. On the assumption that there are no accidental gauge symmetries in Minkowski space, there exists an automorphism $\zeta(T) \in \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle)$ that is implemented by T. Then η and $\zeta(T)$ coincide in Minkowski space, and hence in all spacetimes. Thus we have proved $\mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle) = \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle)$.

The next step is to show that $\mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle)$ and $G_{\rm rce}$ are isomorphic groups. By the above argument, we have a homomorphism $\mu : \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle) \to G_{\rm rce}$ given by $\mu : \zeta \mapsto T_\zeta$, where $T_\zeta \pi(A)\Omega = \pi(\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} A)\Omega$ for all $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and hence $T_\zeta \pi(A) T_\zeta^{-1} = \pi(\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} A)$. As π is faithful, $T_\zeta = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)}$ and hence $\zeta = \mathrm{id}_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle}$, so μ is injective. The absence of accidental gauge transformations shows that to each $U \in G_{\rm rce}$ there is a $\zeta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \gamma, \mathscr{S} \rangle)$ with $T_\zeta \pi(A) T_\zeta^{-1} = U\pi(A)U^{-1}$ for all $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. As π is irreducible and $U\Omega = \Omega = T_\zeta \Omega$ by assumption, we conclude that $U = T_\zeta$, proving that μ is surjective and hence a group isomorphism.

Finally, we observe (using an idea from [15]) that $G_{\rm rce}$ is closed in the strong operator topology, because its defining relations are all preserved under strong limits. Thus compactness of $G_{\rm rce}$ follows from compactness of $G_{\max}$, established in Prop. 4.7 below. $\square$

The compactness of $G_{\max}$ has been proved under various assumptions in the past, e.g., the existence of an asymptotically complete scattering theory with finite particle multiplets [15], or under the assumption of nuclearity, which implies the split property [8] and hence compactness of $G_{\max}$ by (the proof of) [17, Thm 10.4]. However, we wish to point out that compactness of $G_{\max}$ may be established directly and under the weaker energy compactness condition assumed here. The main technical point is the following.

Lemma 4.6 *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a relatively compact subset of a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, with dense linear span. Let G be the group of unitary operators $U \in \mathscr{B}(\mathcal{H})$ obeying $U \,\mathrm{cl}\, \mathcal{N} = \mathrm{cl}\, \mathcal{N}$. Then G is compact with respect to the strong operator topology.*

Proof: As $\mathcal{H}$ is separable, the strong operator topology is metrisable on any bounded subset of $\mathscr{B}(\mathcal{H})$ [33, Prop. 2.7] and convergence and compactness can be determined sequentially.

---

[10] There are cases where proper endomorphisms of algebras are unitarily implemented, e.g., shrinking scale transformation on a suitable local algebra in a conformally covariant theory.

Now, G is certainly closed: any strong limit of a sequence in G must be an isometry mapping the compact set $\mathrm{cl}\,\mathcal{N}$ into itself; by Lem. 4.5 the limit is therefore contained in G. Turning to compactness, choose a sequence U_n in G, and fix a countable linearly independent set of vectors $\psi_j \in \mathcal{N}$ with dense linear span. The sequence $U_n\psi_1$ in $\mathrm{cl}\,\mathcal{N}$ must have convergent subsequences, and we choose a subsequence $U_{n^{(1)}(r)}$ so that $U_{n^{(1)}(r)}\psi_1$ converges. Proceeding inductively, we choose successive subsequences $U_{n^{(k)}(r)}$ so that $U_{n^{(k)}(r)}\psi_j$ converges for each $1 \le j \le k$. The diagonal subsequence $V_k = U_{n^{(k)}(k)}$ converges strongly on each ψ_j and hence on any finite linear combination of the ψ_j. As $\mathrm{span}\,\{\psi_j\}$ is dense and the V_k are uniformly bounded, it follows that the sequence V_k converges strongly to a limit in G. Thus G is sequentially compact and hence compact. □

The desired result follows easily.

Proposition 4.7 *The group $G_{\max}$ is compact in the strong operator topology.*

Proof: Any $U \in G_{\max}$ preserves at least relatively compact set of the form $\mathcal{N} = e^{-\beta H}\mathcal{M}(O)\Omega$, because U acts strictly locally, commutes with the Hamiltonian and has $U\Omega = \Omega$. The next result shows that $G_{\max}$ is contained in a group of unitaries that is compact in the strong operator topology. As $G_{\max}$ is closed in this topology, because its defining relations are preserved under strong limits [15], it is therefore compact. □

Finally, we comment on an alternative (though more restrictive) energy compactness condition for Minkowski space theories, known as the microscopic phase space condition [1]. Theories obeying this condition, along with other standard assumptions, have a definable field content forming finite dimensional subspaces that are sufficient to describe the theory at different orders of a short-distance approximation at sufficiently low energies, and reproduce the total field content of [25]. One would expect that this finite-dimensionality is incompatible with the existence of a proper endomorphism of any locally covariant theory reducing to such a theory in Minkowski space. In this approach one would avoid the assumptions of twisted locality and twisted duality.

5 Scalar fields

As a concrete example, we consider theories of finitely many free minimally coupled scalar fields, specified by a finite set $\mathcal{M} \subset [0,\infty)$ representing the mass spectrum and a function $\nu : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbb{N}$ giving the number of field species with each mass (NB $\nu(m) > 0$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$). The total number of species is denoted $|\nu| = \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \nu(m)$. We consider both the classical and quantum theories, working in a fixed spacetime dimension $n \ge 2$, though some of our results on the quantum field theory hold only in dimension $n \ge 3$.

5.1 Classical theory

The classical theory is described using the category of complexified symplectic spaces, Sympl, defined as follows. An object of Sympl is a triple (V, Γ, σ), consisting of a complex vector space V, an antilinear conjugation $\Gamma : V \to V$ and a weakly nondegenerate antisymmetric bilinear form $\sigma : V \times V \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma(\Gamma v, \Gamma w) = \overline{\sigma(v,w)}$ for all $v, w \in V$. In our applications, V will be a space of complex-valued functions and Γ will be induced by complex conjugation: $(\Gamma f)(p) = \overline{f(p)}$. A morphism $S : (V, \Gamma, \sigma) \to (V', \Gamma', \sigma')$ in Sympl is a (necessarily injective) complex linear map $S : V \to V'$, such that $\sigma'(Sv, Sw) = \sigma(v,w)$ and $\Gamma' S v = S \Gamma v$ hold for all $v, w \in V$.

The theory of a single minimally coupled field of mass $m \geq 0$ is standard and was described in detail from the functorial perspective in [24]. We recall the essential facts only. For any $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$, let $\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})$ be the space of complex-valued solutions ϕ to

$$(\Box_{\boldsymbol{M}} + m^2)\phi = 0 \tag{4}$$

that have compact support on Cauchy surfaces in $\boldsymbol{M}$. (Note: our notation differs slightly from that of [24], where the mass was not indicated explicitly; in particular, for $m = 0$ the present $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$ does *not* coincide with the space $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$ studied in [24], which permits solutions that are compactly supported on Cauchy surfaces following modification by a locally constant function. See also Sect. 5.3 here.) Equipping $\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})$ with complex conjugation and the antisymmetric bilinear form

$$\sigma_{m,\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi, \phi') = \int_\Sigma (\phi n^a \nabla_a \phi' - \phi' n^a \nabla_a \phi)\, d\Sigma,$$

where Σ is a Cauchy surface with future-pointing unit normal n^a, $\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})$ becomes a complexified symplectic space (and the definition is independent of the choice of Σ). The space $\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})$ can also be expressed as $\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M}) = E_{m,\boldsymbol{M}} C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M})$, where $E_{m,\boldsymbol{M}}$ is the solution operator obtained as the difference of the advanced and retarded Green functions for (4). If $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$ in Loc, the corresponding push-forward of test functions $\psi_* : C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}) \to C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{N})$, defined in Eq. (3), induces a unique linear map $\mathscr{L}_m(\psi) : \mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M}) \to \mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{N})$ such that $\mathscr{L}_m(\psi) E_{m,\boldsymbol{M}} f = E_{m,\boldsymbol{N}} \psi_* f$; this is in fact a morphism in Sympl and makes $\mathscr{L}_m$ a functor from Loc to Sympl.

The full complexified symplectic space of our theory is defined by

$$\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}) = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)},$$

with the antisymmetric form $\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ obeying

$$\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}((\phi_m \otimes z_m)_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, (\phi'_m \otimes z'_m)_{m \in \mathcal{M}}) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sigma_m(\phi_m, \phi'_m) z_m^T z'_m,$$

where each $\phi_m \in \mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})$, $z_m \in \mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)}$; here, we regard $\mathbb{C}^k$ as a space of column vectors and write T for transpose. This defines a functor $\mathscr{L} : \mathsf{Loc} \to \mathsf{Sympl}$ in an obvious way, with the conjugation again being the standard complex conjugation.

The theory $\mathscr{L}$ inherits the timeslice property from the theories $\mathscr{L}_m$ [24] and therefore has a relative Cauchy evolution, which is differentiable in the weak symplectic topology (see [24]). Let $\mathrm{Sym}(\boldsymbol{M})$ denote the space of smooth symmetric second rank covariant tensor fields of compact support on each $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$. Then, for each $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$ and $\boldsymbol{f} \in \mathrm{Sym}(\boldsymbol{M})$, there exists a linear and symplectically skew-adjoint map $F_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{f}]$ on $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that

$$\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(F_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{f}]\phi, \phi') = \frac{d}{ds}\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\mathrm{rce}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[s\boldsymbol{f}]\phi, \phi')\bigg|_{s=0} \qquad (\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})). \tag{5}$$

The maps $F_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{f}]$ are related to the classical stress-energy tensor: in fact,

$$\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(F_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{f}]\phi, \overline{\phi}) = \int f_{ab} T^{ab}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\phi]\, d\mathrm{vol}_{\boldsymbol{M}}, \tag{6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\phi]$ is the stress-energy tensor of $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$. In view of the intertwining property (1), any endomorphism $\eta \in \mathscr{L}$ is easily seen to obey $F_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{f}]\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}} F_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{f}]$ and indeed

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi] = \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\phi]$$

for all $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$.

We will need to invoke an additivity property on $\mathscr{L}$. Although Sympl does not admit general categorical unions, the category of complexified presymplectic spaces $\mathsf{preSympl}$ [defined in the same way as Sympl, but dropping the requirement for the symplectic form to be nondegenerate, though nonetheless requiring morphisms to be injective] does have unions and there is a faithful forgetful functor $\mathscr{U} : \mathsf{Sympl} \to \mathsf{preSympl}$. The union in $\mathsf{preSympl}$ is just the linear span of (conjugation-invariant) subspaces. Let $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$ be any spacetime and $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$. We may write $\phi = E_{\boldsymbol{M}} f$ for some $f \in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$ and then use a partition of unity to write f as a finite sum $f = \sum_i f_i$ where each f_i is supported in a diamond D_i in $\boldsymbol{M}$. Then it is evident that ϕ is contained in the span of $E_{\boldsymbol{M}} C_0^\infty(D_i; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$, which is the image of $\mathscr{U}(\mathscr{L}(\iota_{\boldsymbol{M};D_i}))$. Hence $\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{L}$ is additive with respect to diamonds (and thus truncated multi-diamonds).

The endomorphisms of $\mathscr{L}$ may now be classified in terms of the group

$$\mathrm{O}(\nu) = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathrm{O}(\nu(m)),$$

where the factors are the standard groups of real orthogonal matrices.

Lemma 5.1 *Each $R = (R_m)_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \in \mathrm{O}(\nu)$ induces an automorphism $S(R)$ of $\mathscr{L}$ given by*

$$S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})} \otimes R_m, \tag{7}$$

and the map $R \mapsto S(R)$ is an injective group homomorphism of $O(\nu)$ into $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{L})$.

Proof: It is easily seen that $S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is an endomorphism of $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and has inverse $S(R^{-1})_{\boldsymbol{M}}$. If $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} S(R)_{\boldsymbol{N}} \circ \mathscr{L}(\psi) \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \phi_m \otimes z_m &= S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}} \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathscr{L}_m(\psi)\phi_m) \otimes z_m = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathscr{L}_m(\psi)\phi_m \otimes R_m z_m \\ &= \mathscr{L}(\psi) \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \phi_m \otimes z_m = \mathscr{L}(\psi) \circ S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}} \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \phi_m \otimes z_m \end{aligned}$$

for arbitrary $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\phi_m\otimes z_m\in\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and (extending by linearity) we see that $S(R)$ is natural. Thus $S(R)\in\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{L})$; the homomorphism and injectivity properties are clear. $\square$

The main result of this section is that these are the only endomorphisms of $\mathscr{L}$.

Theorem 5.2 *Every endomorphism of $\mathscr{L}$ is an automorphism, and*

$$\mathrm{End}(\mathscr{L})=\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{L})\cong\mathrm{O}(\nu),$$

with the isomorphism given by the homomorphism of Lem. 5.1.

Proof: Owing to the timeslice property and additivity of $\mathscr{U}\circ\mathscr{L}$ in $\mathsf{preSympl}$, Thm 2.5 shows that any $\eta\in\mathrm{End}(\mathscr{L})$ is uniquely determined by its Minkowski space component $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$. Using the fact that $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ preserves the stress-energy tensor and commutes with translations of Minkowski space, Prop. A.1 shows that $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ must take the form

$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}=\bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M}_0)}\otimes R_m,$$

where each R_m is a unitary matrix on $\mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)}$. But as $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ is a morphism in Sympl, it must commute with complex conjugation, so the R_m are real orthogonal matrices, i.e., $R=(R_m)_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\in\mathrm{O}(\nu)$. Thus $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}=S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$, and hence $\eta=S(R)\in\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{L})$. In summary, all endomorphisms are automorphisms, and the homomorphism of Lem. 5.1 is surjective and hence an isomorphism. $\square$

5.2 Quantized theory: Field algebra

Any complexified symplectic space $(V,\sigma,C)\in\mathsf{Sympl}$ has a quantization given by the unital $*$-algebra $\mathscr{Q}(V,\sigma,C)$, whose underlying complex vector space is the symmetric tensor vector space over V,

$$\mathscr{Q}(V,\sigma,C)=\Gamma_{\odot}(V)\overset{\text{def}}{=}\bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}V^{\odot n},\tag{8}$$

(all tensor products and direct sums being purely algebraic) with a product such that

$$u^{\odot m}\cdot v^{\odot n}=\sum_{r=0}^{\min\{m,n\}}\left(\frac{i\sigma(u,v)}{2}\right)^r\frac{m!n!}{r!(m-r)!(n-r)!}S\left(u^{\otimes(m-r)}\otimes v^{\otimes(n-r)}\right),\tag{9}$$

where S denotes symmetrisation, and a $*$-operation defined by $(u^{\odot n})^*=(Cu)^{\odot n}$; both operations being extended by (anti-)linearity to general elements of $\Gamma_{\odot}(V)$. By convention $u^{\odot 0}=1\in V^{\odot 0}=\mathbb{C}$. The nondegeneracy of σ ensures that the algebra $\mathscr{Q}(V,\sigma,C)$ is simple. Moreover, the quantization becomes a functor from Sympl to Alg if we also assign

$$\mathscr{Q}(f)=\Gamma_{\odot}(f)=\bigoplus_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}^{\infty}f^{\odot n}\tag{10}$$

to any morphism $f : (V, \sigma, C) \to (V', \sigma', C')$ in Sympl. We refer to [24] for a full exposition.

The quantization of the classical theory studied in the previous subsection is then obtained simply as the functorial composition $\mathscr{F} = \mathscr{Q} \circ \mathscr{L}$.[11] The additivity of $\mathscr{U} \circ \mathscr{L}$ entails that $\mathscr{Q} \circ \mathscr{L}$ is also additive with respect to truncated multi-diamonds.

It will be useful to describe this theory using 'symplectically smeared fields': for each $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$, let $\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ be the canonical injection of $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ into $\Gamma_{\odot}(\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}))$, i.e., $\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) = 0 \oplus \phi \oplus 0 \oplus \cdots$. Then $\check{\Phi}$ is a natural transformation from $\mathscr{L}$ to $\mathscr{F}$ with the following properties:[12]

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}} : \phi \to \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) \quad & \text{is } \mathbb{C}\text{-linear} \\ \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)^* &= \check{\Phi}(\overline{\phi}) \\ [\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi), \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi')] &= i\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi, \phi')\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

for all $\phi, \phi' \in L(\boldsymbol{M})$. Indeed, these relationships characterize the theory: given any map $\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ from $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ to some $\mathcal{A} \in \mathsf{Alg}$ obeying the above relations, there is a Alg-morphism[13] $\gamma : \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}) \to \mathcal{A}$ such that $\gamma\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) = \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)$, which becomes an isomorphism if $\mathcal{A}$ is generated by the $\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$. The relative Cauchy evolution of $\mathscr{F}$ is closely linked to that of $\boldsymbol{M}$ by $\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{F})}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}] = \mathscr{Q}(\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}])$, which gives

$$\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{F})}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]\check{\Phi}(\phi) = \check{\Phi}(\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]\phi). \tag{12}$$

The usual spacetime smeared fields of the theory are obtained by setting $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f) = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(E_{\boldsymbol{M}} f)$ for $f \in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$, where

$$E_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} E_{m,\boldsymbol{M}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\nu(m)}.$$

We introduce a state space as follows. For each $\boldsymbol{M}$, let $\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ be the set of all states ω on $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that all k-point functions are distributional, in the sense that

$$f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_k \mapsto \omega(\Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f_1) \cdots \Phi_{\boldsymbol{M}}(f_k))$$

defines a vector-valued distribution on $\boldsymbol{M}^{\times k}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a much larger state space than the Hadamard class usually employed; our results would be unaltered by restricting to this class. It is easily seen that $\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is closed under convex linear combinations and with respect to operations induced by $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$; moreover, the pull-back of a distribution by a smooth embedding is also a distribution, so $\mathscr{F}(\psi)^*\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{N}) \subset \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ for any $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$. Thus, $\mathscr{S}(\psi)$ may be defined uniquely so that the diagram

---

[11] In [24], the analogous theory was denoted as $\mathscr{F}$, as is traditional in QFT in CST; here, we adopt the AQFT convention, that field algebras are denoted with an 'F' and observable algebras with an 'A'.

[12] More precisely, $\check{\Phi}$ is natural between compositions of $\mathscr{L}$ and $\mathscr{F}$ with suitable forgetful functors.

[13] The fact that the morphism is monic can be seen because $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is simple.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{N}) \arrow[r, "\mathscr{S}(\psi)"] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}) \arrow[d, hook] \\
\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{N})^* \arrow[r, "\mathscr{F}(\psi)^*"] & \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})^*
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes, where the unlabelled maps are the obvious inclusions. With this definition, $\mathscr{S}$ becomes a state space functor. As this theory obeys commutation at spacelike separation, we may represent it as $\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle \in \mathsf{xLCT}$, and the task is to classify all its endomorphisms, i.e., natural transformations $\eta : \mathscr{F} \stackrel{.}{\to} \mathscr{F}$ such that $\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}) \subset \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$ for all $\boldsymbol{M}$.[14]

As a first observation, note that any $\zeta \in \mathrm{End}(\mathscr{L})$ lifts to an endomorphism $\mathscr{Q}[\zeta]$ of $\mathscr{F}$ with components $\mathscr{Q}[\zeta]_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \mathscr{Q}(\zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}})$, and that $\mathscr{Q}[\zeta]$ is an automorphism if $\zeta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{L})$, because functors preserve isomorphisms. Thus Thm 5.2 shows that $\mathrm{O}(\nu) \ni R \mapsto \mathscr{Q}[S(R)] \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F})$ is a group homomorphism. For theories with no massless components (i.e., $\nu(0) = 0$) this will turn out to give the full class of endomorphisms of $\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle$. However, a peculiarity of the massless theories is that they admit an enlarged class of automorphisms and our general result is that $\mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ is isomorphic to

$$G(\nu) = \mathrm{O}(\nu) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{\nu(0)*},$$

where $\mathbb{R}^{k*}$ is the additive group of real k-dimensional row vectors (with the convention that this is the trivial group if $k = 0$) and the semidirect product is defined by

$$((R_m)_{m\in\mathcal{M}}, \ell) \cdot ((R'_m)_{m\in\mathcal{M}}, \ell') = ((R_m R'_m)_{m\in\mathcal{M}}, \ell R'_0 + \ell') \,.$$

To explain the action of $G(\nu)$, we require some notation. For any $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$, let ϕ_0 be the component of ϕ in $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)}$, regarded as a $\nu(0)$-dimensional column vector with entries in $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$. Given $\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)*}$, the matrix product $\ell\phi_0$ yields an element of $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$. With these conventions, we define

$$\langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \sigma_{0,\boldsymbol{M}}(\ell\phi_0, 1_{\boldsymbol{M}}), \tag{13}$$

where $1_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is the unit constant function on $\boldsymbol{M}$. It is easily verified that

$$\langle \ell, \mathscr{L}(\psi)\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{N}} = \langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}} \tag{14}$$

holds for all $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and $\psi : \boldsymbol{M} \to \boldsymbol{N}$. The group $G(\nu)$ acts in the following way.

Proposition 5.3 *To each $(R, \ell) \in G(\nu)$ there is an automorphism $\zeta(R, \ell)$ of $\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle$ such that*

$$\zeta(R, \ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi) + \langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})} \tag{15}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathsf{Loc}$, $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$. Moreover, $(R, \ell) \mapsto \zeta(R, \ell)$ defines a group monomorphism $\zeta : G(\nu) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$.

---

[14] Although it is a natural conjecture that the classification is purely algebraic, independent of the state space, our manner of proof requires a certain degree of continuity at particular points.

Proof. First, we check that (15) determines an automorphism of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ for arbitrary $(R,\ell)\in G(\nu)$. Writing the right-hand side as $\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)$, it is straightforward to verify that $\phi\mapsto\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)$ is a linear map of $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$ to $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that $\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)^* = \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\overline{\phi})$ and

$$[\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi), \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi')] = i\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi,\phi')\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}.$$

Thus there is a unique endomorphism $\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ such that (15) holds. This is invertible, with inverse $\zeta((R,\ell)^{-1})_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, so $\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\in\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}))$. Moreover, if a state ω has distributional k-point functions, so does $\zeta(R,\ell)^*_{\boldsymbol{M}}\omega$; here, we use the fact that

$$\langle\ell, E_{0,\boldsymbol{M}}f\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \int_{\boldsymbol{M}}\ell\circ f\,d\mathrm{vol}_{\boldsymbol{M}}$$

is evidently continuous in f. Hence $\zeta(R,\ell)^*_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}) = \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M})$, using the fact that $\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is an isomorphism.

Next, for any $\boldsymbol{M}\xrightarrow{\psi}\boldsymbol{N}$, the computation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}(\psi)\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) &= \mathscr{F}(\psi)\left(\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi) + \langle\ell,\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}\right)\\ &= \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{N}}(\mathscr{L}(\psi)S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi) + \langle\ell,\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{N})}\\ &= \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{N}}(S(R)_{\boldsymbol{N}}\mathscr{L}(\psi)\phi) + \langle\ell,\mathscr{L}(\psi)\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{N}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{N})}\\ &= \zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{N}}\mathscr{F}(\psi)\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi),\end{aligned}$$

in which we have used $S(R)\in\mathrm{End}(\mathscr{L})$ and Eq. (14), shows that the components $\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ form a natural transformation $\zeta(R,\ell):\mathscr{F}\overset{.}{\to}\mathscr{F}$, whereupon $\zeta(R,\ell)\in\mathrm{Aut}(\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle)$. That $\zeta: G(\nu)\ni(R,\ell)\mapsto\zeta(R,\ell)\in\mathrm{Aut}(\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle)$ is a homomorphism holds because

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\zeta(R',\ell')_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) &= \zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}\left[\check{\Phi}(S(R')_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi) + \langle\ell',\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}\right]\\ &= \check{\Phi}(S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}S(R')_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi) + \left(\langle\ell,S(R')_{\boldsymbol{M}}\phi\rangle + \langle\ell',\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}}\right)\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}\\ &= \zeta(RR',\ell S(R')+\ell')\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi),\end{aligned}$$

and the proof that ζ is a monomorphism is straightforward. □

The main result of this section is that every endomorphism of $\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle$ is one of the automorphisms just constructed. Our proof uses the Fock representation of the Minkowski vacuum state; as there is no such state for massless fields in $n=2$ spacetime dimensions, we must exclude this case from the current treatment.

Theorem 5.4 *For spacetime dimension $n\ge 3$, every endomorphism of $\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle$ is an automorphism. Moreover, the monomorphism $\zeta: G(\nu)\to\mathrm{Aut}(\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle)$ of Prop. 5.3 is an isomorphism of groups, so we have*

$$\mathrm{End}(\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle) = \mathrm{Aut}(\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle)\cong G(\nu).$$

In spacetime dimension $n=2$, the same result holds provided that $\nu(0)=0$, (so in fact $\mathrm{Aut}(\langle\mathscr{F},\mathrm{id},\mathscr{S}\rangle)\cong\mathrm{O}(\nu)$).

Proof: Given any $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$, the transformed symplectically smeared field $\check{\Psi} = \eta \circ \check{\Phi}$ obeys many of the same properties as $\check{\Phi}$; namely, its behaviour under adjoints

$$\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi)^* = (\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi))^* = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi))^* = \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\overline{\phi}) = \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\overline{\phi}) \tag{16}$$

and the commutation relations

$$[\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi), \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi')] = [\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi), \eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi')] = i\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi, \phi')\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})} = i\sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi, \phi')\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})}. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, Eqs. (12) and (1) entail that

$$\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{F})}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) = \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}}[\boldsymbol{h}]\phi). \tag{18}$$

We now focus on Minkowski space $\boldsymbol{M}_0$. Using properties of the vacuum representation, we show in Prop. 5.6 below that $\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ takes the form

$$\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi) = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(S\phi) + \langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)} \qquad (\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)) \tag{19}$$

for some linear map $S : \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \to \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)*}$ [with $\ell = 0$ if $\nu(0) = 0$]. Substituting in Eq. (18) and using Eq. (12), we find

$$\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]S\phi) + \langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)} = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(S\mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]\phi) + \langle \ell, \mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)}$$

and may deduce that S commutes with the relative Cauchy evolution in $\boldsymbol{M}_0$ (the identity $\langle \ell, \mathrm{rce}^{(\mathscr{L})}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}[\boldsymbol{h}]\phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} = \langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ gives no additional constraint). Accordingly, ϕ and $S\phi$ have identical (classical) stress-energy tensors; moreover S commutes with the action of spacetime translations by naturality of η, and obeys $S\overline{\phi} = \overline{S\phi}$ owing to Eq. (16). Prop. A.1 implies that $S = S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ for some $R = (R_m)_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \in \mathrm{O}(\nu)$, and Eq. (16) also shows that ℓ is real. Hence $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} = \zeta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(R, \ell)$, and as $\mathscr{F}$ is additive with respect to truncated multi-diamonds and has the timeslice property, we may conclude from Thm 2.5 that $\eta = \zeta(R, \ell) \in \mathrm{Aut}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$, and the result now follows immediately. $\square$

The remaining task is to prove Prop. 5.6. Our argument uses particular features of the standard Minkowski vacuum state ω, which exists for $n \geq 3$, or $n = 2$ provided $\nu(0) = 0$. Let us briefly recall some properties of the induced GNS representation $(\mathcal{F}, \pi, \mathcal{D}, \Omega)$ of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. First, we will denote the one-particle Hilbert space by $\mathcal{H}$, so $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_\odot(\mathcal{H})$. Second, to each translation $\tau^y(x) = x + y$, there is a unitary $U(y) = \exp(iy^aP_a)$ so that $U(y)\pi(A)U(y)^{-1} = \pi(\mathscr{F}(\tau^y)A)$ for all $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. The momentum operators P_a are defined on a domain in $\mathcal{F}$ including $\mathcal{D} = \pi(\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0))\Omega$, on which $y \mapsto U(y)$ is therefore strongly differentiable; the joint spectrum of the P_a lies in the closed forward lightcone. Third, the discrete spectrum of the mass-squared operator P^aP_a is $\sigma_{\mathrm{disc}}(P^aP_a) = \{0\} \cup \{m^2 : m \in \mathcal{M}\}$. Denoting the eigenspace of eigenvalue m^2 by $\mathcal{H}_m$, the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_m$ for $m > 0$ are subspaces of the one-particle space $\mathcal{H}$, while $\mathcal{H}_0$ is spanned by the one-particle states of any massless fields and the vacuum vector, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}\Omega \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}\setminus\{0\}} \mathcal{H}_m\right)^{\perp} \subset \mathcal{F},$$

where the orthogonal complement is taken in $\mathcal{H}$. Fourth, the vacuum vector Ω is separating for the representation π, i.e., $\pi(A)\Omega = 0$ iff $A = 0$. Fifth, we have the following:

Lemma 5.5 *Suppose $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ is such that $\pi(A)\Omega \in \mathcal{H}_m$ for some $m \geq 0$. Then $A = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi) + \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)}$ for unique $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, which obey $\mathcal{M}\phi = m\phi$. If $m > 0$, α must vanish.*

Proof: As $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0) = \Gamma_\odot(\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0))$, each nonzero $A \in \mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ therefore has a degree $\deg A$, which is the maximum $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $A^{(n)} \neq 0$, where $A^{(n)}$ is the component of A in $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)^{\odot n}$; we assign a degree -1 to the zero element of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. Moreover, the vacuum Ω induces a normal ordering operation on $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, so that $\pi({:}A{:}_\Omega) = {:}\pi(A){:}$, where the normal ordering on the right-hand side is that of the Fock space $\mathcal{F}$. A key fact is that $\deg(A - {:}A{:}_\Omega) = \max\{-1, \deg(A) - 2\}$. Now $\deg A$ can also be characterized as the maximum $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ for which $\Upsilon = \pi(A)\Omega$ has nonvanishing component in the n-particle space in Fock space: to see this, note that Υ clearly has vanishing component in all higher n-particle spaces, while its projection onto the $\deg A$-particle space coincides with ${:}\pi(A){:}\Omega = \pi({:}A{:}_\Omega)\Omega$; if this should vanish then ${:}A{:}_\Omega = 0$ because Ω is separating for π, and hence $\deg A = \max\{\deg(A) - 2, -1\}$, which implies $A = 0$.

Now suppose that $\pi(A)\Omega \in \mathcal{H}_m$, which lies in the 1-particle space if $m \neq 0$, or the span of the 0 and 1-particle spaces if $m = 0$. Accordingly, if $A \neq 0$, we must have $\deg A = 1$ for $m > 0$ and $\deg A \leq 1$ if $m = 0$. The result follows. $\square$

Finally, we may state and prove the remaining result.

Proposition 5.6 *Let $\eta \in \mathrm{End}(\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathrm{id}, \mathscr{S}\rangle)$ and define $\check{\Psi} = \eta \circ \check{\Phi}$. Then there exists a unique linear map $S : \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \to \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)*}$ [with $\ell = 0$ if $\nu(0) = 0$] and*

$$\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi) = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(S\phi) + \langle \ell, \phi \rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} \mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)},$$

for all $\phi \in L(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$.

Proof: In the vacuum representation, consider vectors of the form $\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega$ for $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. The properties of $U(y)$ mentioned above entail that

$$U(y)\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega = \pi(\mathscr{F}(\tau^y)\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega = \pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(L(\tau^y)\phi))\Omega. \tag{20}$$

Let e_a ($a = 0, \ldots, n-1$) be standard inertial basis vectors. Putting $y = se_a$, the left-hand side may be differentiated with respect to s to give $iP_a\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega$ at $s = 0$. To evaluate the derivative of the right-hand side, we set $\phi = E_{\boldsymbol{M}} f$ for $f \in C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}_0; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$. Then

$$s^{-1}(\mathscr{L}(\tau^{se_a})\phi - \phi) + \nabla_a \phi = E_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\left(s^{-1}[\tau_*^{se_a} f - f] + \nabla_a f\right)$$

and the parenthesis on the right-hand side tends to 0 in $C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}_0; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$. Now

$$\|\pi(\check{\Psi}(E_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} h))\Omega\|^2 = (\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}^* \omega)(\check{\Phi}(E_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\overline{h})\check{\Phi}(E_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} h)),$$

which is a 2-point function for the state $\eta_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}^*\omega \in \mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, and therefore a distribution. Thus $\pi(\check{\Psi}(E_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} h))\Omega \to 0$ in $\mathcal{F}$ as $h \to 0$ in $C_0^\infty(\boldsymbol{M}_0; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$ and the left-hand side of (20) has the derivative one would expect, namely $-\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\nabla_a\phi))\Omega$. Accordingly, $P_a\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega = \pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(i\nabla_a\phi))\Omega$ for any $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and hence

$$P_aP^a\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega = \pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(-\Box_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\phi))\Omega = \pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\mathcal{M}^2\phi))\Omega, \tag{21}$$

where we have abused notation by writing $\Box_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ and $\mathcal{M}^2$ as a shorthand for the operators

$$\bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \Box_{\boldsymbol{M}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\nu(m)}, \qquad \bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}} m^2\mathbf{1}_{L(\boldsymbol{M})} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\nu(m)}$$

on $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M})$. From Eq. (21) we see that $\mathcal{M}\phi = m\phi$ implies $\pi(\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi))\Omega \in \mathcal{H}_m$. According to Lem. 5.5, we may therefore deduce that, for general $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$,

$$\check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi) = \check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(S\phi) + \alpha(\phi_0)\mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)}, \tag{22}$$

where ϕ_0 is the component of ϕ in $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)}$ and $S : \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \to \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and $\alpha : \mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)} \to \mathbb{C}$ are uniquely determined and necessarily linear maps (we can also deduce $S\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}S$). It remains to determine α. By Eq. (22), it is clear that

$$\alpha(\phi_0) = \langle \Omega \mid \check{\Psi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi)\Omega\rangle = (\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\omega)(\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(\phi)).$$

As $\eta^*_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}\omega$ is a translationally invariant state in $\mathscr{S}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ by Lem. 2.1, it follows that

$$\mathscr{D}(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)} \ni f \mapsto (\alpha \circ (E_{0\,\boldsymbol{M}_0} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\nu(0)}))(f) \in \mathbb{C}$$

may be regarded as a row vector of translationally invariant distributions, each component of which must be constant. Thus there is $\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)*}$ such that

$$(\alpha \circ (E_{0,\boldsymbol{M}_0} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\nu(0)}))(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu(0)} \int_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} \ell_i f^i d\mathrm{vol}_{\boldsymbol{M}_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu(0)} \ell_i \sigma_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}(E_{0,\boldsymbol{M}_0} f^i, 1)$$

and in fact we must have $\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}$ to obtain $\alpha(\overline{\phi_0}) = \overline{\alpha(\phi_0)}$. Accordingly, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu(0)*}$ such that $\alpha(\phi_0) = \langle \ell, \phi\rangle_{\boldsymbol{M}_0}$ for all $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$, completing the proof. $\Box$

5.3 Quantized theory: Algebra of Observables

In each spacetime $\boldsymbol{M}$, the algebra of observables $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ may be concretely constructed as the subalgebra of the field algebra $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ of elements invariant under $\zeta(R,\ell)_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ for all $(R,\ell) \in G(\nu) = \mathrm{O}(\nu) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^{\nu(0)*}$. Let us first consider the issue of $\mathbb{R}^{\nu(0)*}$-invariance (assuming $\nu(0) > 0$).

Let $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_0}(\boldsymbol{M})$ be the subspace of $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$ consisting of solutions with vanishing symplectic product with the constant unit solution. We call these 'charge-zero' solutions, because this symplectic product is precisely the Noether charge corresponding to the rigid gauge freedom to add a constant solution (the same constant in all connected components of $\boldsymbol{M}$). The subspace $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_0}(\boldsymbol{M})$ has codimension 1 in $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$; we choose any $\theta \in \mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$ with

$\sigma_{0,\boldsymbol{M}}(\theta, 1_{\boldsymbol{M}}) = 1$, which then spans a complementary subspace to $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_0}(\boldsymbol{M})$ in $\mathscr{L}_0(\boldsymbol{M})$. For notational simplicity, it is also convenient to write $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_m}(\boldsymbol{M}) = \mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M})$ for any $m > 0$. With these choices, any $A \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ may be written in the form

$$A = \sum_{k=0}^{\deg A} \sum_{|\alpha| \le k} S\left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{\nu(0)} (\theta \otimes e_i)^{\otimes \alpha_i} \right) \otimes Z_{k,\alpha} \right),$$

where the sum runs over all muti-indices α of total order $|\alpha| \le k$, the e_i are a standard real basis for $\mathbb{C}^{\nu(0)}$, S is the symmetrisation operator and

$$Z_{k,\alpha} \in \widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M})^{\odot(k-|\alpha|)}, \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M}) := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \widehat{\mathscr{L}_m}(\boldsymbol{M}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)}.$$

Let $e_i^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu(0)*}$ be the dual basis to e_i. Then because the polynomial $\lambda \mapsto \zeta(\mathbf{1}, \lambda e_j^*)_{\boldsymbol{M}} A$ is constant, the coefficient of λ must vanish, i.e.,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\deg A} \sum_{|\alpha| \le k} \alpha_j S\left(\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{\nu(0)} (\theta \otimes e_i)^{\otimes(\alpha_i - \delta_{ij})} \right) \otimes Z_{k,\alpha} \right) = 0,$$

and every $Z_{k,\alpha}$ vanishes for which $\alpha_j > 0$. (One sees this most easily by working downwards in degree.) As $1 \le j \le \nu(0)$ is arbitrary, this gives $Z_{k,\alpha} = 0$ for all $|\alpha| > 0$. Accordingly, all generators appearing in $A \in \mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ are drawn from $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M})$, i.e., $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M}) \subset \Gamma_\odot(\widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M}))$.

Turning to the $\mathrm{O}(\nu)$ invariance, let us now suppose that $A \in \Gamma_\odot(\widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M}))$ obeys $\zeta(R, 0)_{\boldsymbol{M}} A = A$ for all $R \in \mathrm{O}(\nu)$. Because $\zeta(R, 0)_{\boldsymbol{M}} = \Gamma_\odot(S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}})$, where $S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}$ is defined in Eq. (7), the component A_k of A in each $\widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M})^{\otimes k}$ must be invariant under $S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}^{\otimes k}$. Now we may identify

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathscr{L}}(\boldsymbol{M})^{\otimes k} &= \left(\bigoplus_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \widehat{\mathscr{L}_m} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)} \right)^{\otimes k} \cong \bigoplus_{\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{\times k}} \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k} (\widehat{\mathscr{L}_{m_i}}(\boldsymbol{M}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\nu(m_i)}) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{\times k}} \bigotimes_{m' \in \underline{m}} \left(\left(\widehat{\mathscr{L}_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{M})^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')} \right) \otimes (\mathbb{C}^{\nu(m')})^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{\times k}$ is a k-tuple $\underline{m} = \langle m_1, \ldots, m_k \rangle$, and $\mu_{\underline{m}}(m')$ is the multiplicity of m' as an element of $\underline{m}$, and the product in the last expression is indexed over elements of $\underline{m}$ *disregarding multiplicity.* With respect to the last decomposition, we have

$$S(R)_{\boldsymbol{M}}^{\otimes k} = \bigoplus_{\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}^{\times k}} \bigotimes_{m' \in \underline{m}} \mathrm{id} \otimes R_{m'}^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')}.$$

Owing to the direct sum structure, the element A_k decomposes into components $A_{k,\underline{m}}$, each of which is an eigenvector of unit eigenvalue for every $\bigotimes_{m' \in \underline{m}} (\mathrm{id} \otimes R_{m'}^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')})$ $((R_{m'})_{m' \in \underline{m}} \in \prod_{m' \in \underline{m}} \mathrm{O}(\nu(m')))$. Some multi-linear algebra (cf. e.g., [24, Appx A]) entails that

$$A_{k,\underline{m}} \in \bigotimes_{m' \in \underline{m}} \widehat{\mathscr{L}_{m'}}(\boldsymbol{M})^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')} \otimes Y_{m'},$$

where each $Y_{m'} \subset (\mathbb{C}^{\nu(m')})^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')}$ is an eigenspace of unit eigenvalue for $R^{\otimes \mu_{\underline{m}}(m')}$ for all $R \in \mathrm{O}(\nu(m'))$. Its elements are thus isotropic tensors (under the full orthogonal group) of rank $\mu_{\underline{m}}(m')$ in $\nu(m')$ dimensions. By classical results [36], these are known to be scalars at rank 0, products of Kronecker deltas for other even ranks, and vanishing for odd rank. As A is an element of the symmetric tensor vector space, we have shown that $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is contained in the $*$-subalgebra of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ generated by all bilinear elements of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\nu(m)} \check{\Phi}(\phi \otimes e_i)\check{\Phi}(\phi' \otimes e_i) \tag{23}$$

for $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $\phi, \phi' \in \widehat{\mathscr{L}_m}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and with e_i the standard real basis of $\mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)}$, orthonormal with respect to the standard inner product. As this subalgebra is manifestly invariant under the action of $G(\nu)$, we have proved:

Theorem 5.7 *The algebra of observables $\mathscr{A}(\boldsymbol{M})$ is the $*$-subalgebra of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ generated by all bilinear elements of the form Eq.* (23) *where $\phi, \phi' \in \widehat{\mathscr{L}_m}(\boldsymbol{M})$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$.*

In the case where $\boldsymbol{M}$ has more than one connected component, we see that the solutions ϕ, ϕ' appearing in Eq. (23) may have support in more than one component of the spacetime. One might not wish to regard these as observables. Adopting the more restricted 'true algebra of observables' described at the end of Sect. 3.3, the generating set would be restricted to bilinears for which ϕ, ϕ' have support in a single common component of $\boldsymbol{M}$.

Finally, let us specialize to the case of a single massless field,[15] and compare the algebra of observables obtained here with the discussion of the massless current in [24], in which the classical invariance of the action under addition of locally constant solutions (which may take distinct values on different connected components of spacetime) is treated as a classical gauge symmetry. This gives a classical phase space of gauge equivalence classes $[\phi]$ of solutions to the massless Klein–Gordon equation,[16] whose symplectic products with locally constant functions must be taken to vanish in order to obtain a well-defined (and, in fact, weakly non-degenerate) symplectic product on the quotient. Quantizing, a locally covariant theory $\mathscr{C}$ is obtained, in which all $\mathscr{C}(\boldsymbol{M})$ are simple, with generators $\check{\mathsf{J}}_{\boldsymbol{M}}([\phi])$ obeying relations analogous to those in (11).

This is most directly comparable to the fixed-point subalgebra $\widehat{\mathscr{F}}(\boldsymbol{M})$ of $\mathscr{F}(\boldsymbol{M})$ under the noncompact factor in the gauge group $\mathbb{Z}^2 \ltimes \mathbb{R}^*$. Here, the generators are labelled by solutions with vanishing symplectic product with the constant solution $1_{\boldsymbol{M}}$, i.e., the space $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_0}(\boldsymbol{M})$. If $\boldsymbol{M}$ is connected, and has noncompact Cauchy surfaces, then $\check{\Phi}_{\boldsymbol{M}}(\phi) \mapsto \check{\mathsf{J}}_{\boldsymbol{M}}([\phi])$ determines an isomorphism of the two algebras. However, this isomorphism breaks down if $\boldsymbol{M}$ is disconnected (because not all solutions in $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_0}(\boldsymbol{M})$ have vanishing symplectic product with every locally constant function) or has compact Cauchy surface (because then $\widehat{\mathscr{L}_0}(\boldsymbol{M})$

---

[15] Analogous comments apply to any of the theories with $\nu(0) > 0$.

[16] These solutions are permitted to have noncompact support, but must be locally constant outside the causal future and past of some compact set.

contain nonzero locally constant functions χ, which correspond to nonzero elements in the centre of $\widehat{\mathscr{F}}(\boldsymbol{M})$; on the other hand, $[\chi]$ and hence $\check{\mathsf{J}}_{\boldsymbol{M}}([\chi])$ vanish).

The first problem may be removed by passing to the 'true algebra of observables', namely the $*$-subalgebra $\widehat{\mathscr{F}_o}(\boldsymbol{M})$ of $\widehat{\mathscr{F}}(\boldsymbol{M})$ generated by the $\check{\mathsf{J}}(\phi)$ with vanishing symplectic product with the characteristic function of each component of $\boldsymbol{M}$, and hence with every locally constant function. However, the second problem remains, whenever $\boldsymbol{M}$ has a component with compact Cauchy surface; in general $\mathscr{C}(\boldsymbol{M})$ (with the modification mentioned) is isomorphic to the quotient of $\widehat{\mathscr{F}_o}(\boldsymbol{M})$ by the ideal generated by its centre. We mention that these central elements are also responsible for the failure of the theory $\mathscr{F}$ to be dynamically local [23, 24].

Acknowledgments It is a pleasure to thank Henning Bostelmann, Roberto Conti, Matthew Ferguson and Rainer Verch for useful discussions concerning various aspects of this work.

A Maps preserving the stress-energy tensor

Proposition A.1 *Suppose $S : \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0) \to \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ is a linear map so that $S\phi$ and ϕ have identical total stress-energy tensors for all $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ and such that S commutes with complex conjugation and the action of spacetime translations on $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$. Then there are orthogonal matrices $R_m \in \mathrm{O}(\nu(m))$ such that*

$$S = \bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathscr{L}_m(\boldsymbol{M}_0)} \otimes R_m .$$

Remark: No continuity assumptions are required on S.

Proof: First, observe that we may regard any $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ as a smooth function on $\boldsymbol{M}_0$ taking values in $\mathbb{C}^{|\nu|} := \oplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\mathbb{C}^{\nu(m)}$. Putting the standard norm on the latter space, we have the identity $T_{ab}\ell^a\ell^b|_p = \|\ell^a\nabla_a\phi|_p\|^2$ at any point $p \in \boldsymbol{M}_0$, for any null vector ℓ^a and for any $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$; it follows that S must obey $\|(\ell^a\nabla_a S\phi)|_p\|^2 = \|\ell^a\nabla_a\phi|_p\|^2$. It is also convenient to work in terms of Cauchy data on, e.g., the $t = 0$ surface in standard inertial coordinates on $\boldsymbol{M}_0$ in which the interval is $d\tau^2 = dt^2 - \delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j$. Then each $\phi \in \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{M}_0)$ is uniquely associated with a pair $(\varphi, \pi) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \mathbb{C}^\nu) \oplus C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \mathbb{C}^\nu)$, where $\varphi(x) = \phi(0, x)$, $\pi(x) = (\partial\varphi/\partial t)(0, x)$. Thus S induces a linear map $\widetilde{S}$ on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|}) \oplus C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}; \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$ such that $(\varphi', \pi') = \widetilde{S}(\varphi, \pi)$ is the Cauchy data of $S\phi$. The preservation of the stress-energy tensor may be written

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla & \mathbf{1}_\nu \end{pmatrix} \widetilde{S} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \pi \end{pmatrix}(x) \right\| = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla & \mathbf{1}_\nu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \pi \end{pmatrix}(x) \right\| \tag{24}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is any unit vector. In particular, defining the map

$$U : \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \pi \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla & \mathbf{1}_{|\nu|} \end{pmatrix} \widetilde{S} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \pi \end{pmatrix}(0) \in \mathbb{C}^{|\nu|}$$

on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1};\mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})\oplus C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1};\mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$, we have the estimate

$$\left\| U\begin{pmatrix}\varphi\\ \pi\end{pmatrix}\right\| \le \|(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0)\| + \|\pi(0)\|, \tag{25}$$

which proves that U is a $(|\nu|\times 2|\nu|)$-matrix of distributions each of which is supported at the origin. We may therefore conclude that

$$U\begin{pmatrix}\varphi\\ \pi\end{pmatrix} = A\varphi(0) + B\pi(0) + C^j(\nabla_j\varphi)(0) + D^j(\nabla_j\pi)(0)$$

for $(|\nu|\times|\nu|)$-matrices A, B, C^j and D^j, where $1\le j\le n-1$. It is easy to show that $A = D^j = 0$ for all j, on considering the estimate (25) in cases where π and $\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi = 0$, and likewise that only derivatives of φ along $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ can contribute. This gives

$$U\begin{pmatrix}\varphi\\ \pi\end{pmatrix} = R(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0) + B\pi(0)$$

for matrices R and B, which in principle may depend on $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. Moreover, Eq. (24) entails

$$\|R(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0) + B\pi(0)\| = \|(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0) + \pi(0)\|,$$

from which we may conclude that R and B are unitary and in fact equal (again, by considering cases in which $\pi(0) = 0$ or $\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi(0) = 0$). In terms of the Cauchy data (φ',π') of $S\phi$, the discussion so far has shown that

$$(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi')(0) + \pi'(0) = R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0) + R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}\pi(0)$$

for some unitary matrix $R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}$, from which we may deduce

$$(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi')(0) = \frac{1}{2}\left([R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} + R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}](\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0) + [R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} - R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}]\pi(0)\right) \tag{26}$$

$$\pi'(0) = \frac{1}{2}\left([R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} - R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}](\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi)(0) + [R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} + R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}]\pi(0)\right). \tag{27}$$

Considering data with $\varphi\equiv 0$, we see from the $\boldsymbol{\ell}$-independence of the left-hand side of Eq. (27) that $\frac{1}{2}(R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} + R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}) = R$, independent of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. Then Eq. (26) becomes

$$(\boldsymbol{\ell}\cdot\nabla\varphi')(0) = \frac{1}{2}[R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} - R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}]\pi(0)$$

and, as $\pi(0)\in\mathbb{C}^{|\nu|}$ is arbitrary, we deduce by linearity of the left-hand side in $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ that $\frac{1}{2}[R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} - R_{-\boldsymbol{\ell}}] = \ell^i\Delta_i$ for $(|\nu|\times|\nu|)$-matrices Δ_i $(1\le i\le n-1)$. Substituting back into Eqs. (26) and (27), and considering data where $\pi\equiv 0$, we have $\pi'(0) = \ell^i\ell^j\Delta_i(\nabla_j\varphi)(0)$ for all unit vectors $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. As the right-hand side is $\boldsymbol{\ell}$-independent, we have $\Delta_i(\nabla_j\varphi)(0)\propto\delta_{ij}$ for all $\varphi\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n-1};\mathbb{C}^{|\nu|})$, which is possible only if $\Delta_i = 0$ for all $1\le i\le n-1$. Thus $R_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} = R$, independent of $\boldsymbol{\ell}$, and it follows that $\pi'(0) = R\pi(0)$ and $(\nabla\varphi')(0) = R\varphi(0)$ for general data (φ, π). Further, because S and hence $\widetilde{S}$ commute with spatial translations, there is a fixed unitary $R \in \mathrm{U}(|\nu|)$ so that

$$\widetilde{S}\left(\begin{array}{c}\varphi\\ \pi\end{array}\right)(x) = \left(\begin{array}{c}R\varphi(x)\\ R\pi(x)\end{array}\right).$$

Finally, because S also commutes with time translations we have $(S\phi)(t,x) = R\phi(t,x)$. But both ϕ and $S\phi$ solve the same field equation $\Box\varphi + \mathcal{M}^2\varphi = 0$, so R commutes with $\mathcal{M}^2$ and decomposes into block diagonal form, $R = \bigoplus_{m\in\mathcal{M}} R_m$, where each $R_m \in \mathrm{U}(\nu(m))$. Since S commutes with complex conjugation, the R_m are real and hence orthogonal. $\Box$

References

[1] Bostelmann, H.: Phase space properties and the short distance structure in quantum field theory. J. Math. Phys. **46**, 052301, 17pp (2005)

[2] Brunetti, R., Fredenhagen, K.: Microlocal analysis and interacting quantum field theories: Renormalization on physical backgrounds. Commun. Math. Phys. **208**, 623–661 (2000)

[3] Brunetti, R., Fredenhagen, K., Verch, R.: The generally covariant locality principle: A new paradigm for local quantum physics. Commun. Math. Phys. **237**, 31–68 (2003)

[4] Brunetti, R., Ruzzi, G.: Superselection sectors and general covariance. I. Commun. Math. Phys. **270**, 69–108 (2007)

[5] Brunetti, R., Ruzzi, G.: Quantum charges and spacetime topology: The emergence of new superselection sectors. Commun. Math. Phys. **287**, 523–563 (2009)

[6] Buchholz, D., Junglas, P.: On the existence of equilibrium states in local quantum field theory. Comm. Math. Phys. **121**, 255–270 (1989)

[7] Buchholz, D., Porrmann, M.: How small is the phase space in quantum field theory? Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor. **52**, 237–257 (1990)

[8] Buchholz, D., Wichmann, E.H.: Causal independence and the energy-level density of states in local quantum field theory. Comm. Math. Phys. **106**, 321–344 (1986)

[9] Carpi, S., Conti, R.: Classification of subsystems for local nets with trivial superselection structure. Comm. Math. Phys. **217**, 89–106 (2001)

[10] Carpi, S., Conti, R.: Classification of subsystems for graded-local nets with trivial superselection structure. Comm. Math. Phys. **253**, 423–449 (2005)

[11] Ciolli, F., Ruzzi, G., Vasselli, E.: Causal posets, loops and the construction of nets of local algebras for QFT (2011). arXiv:1109.4824

[12] Dappiaggi, C., Fredenhagen, K., Pinamonti, N.: Stable cosmological models driven by a free quantum scalar field. Phys. Rev. **D77**, 104015 (2008)

[13] Degner, A., Verch, R.: Cosmological particle creation in states of low energy. J. Math. Phys. **51**, 022302 (2010)

[14] Dikranjan, D., Tholen, W.: Categorical structure of closure operators, *Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 346. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht (1995)

[15] Doplicher, S., Haag, R., Roberts, J.E.: Fields, observables and gauge transformations. I. Comm. Math. Phys. **13**, 1–23 (1969)

[16] Doplicher, S., Haag, R., Roberts, J.E.: Fields, observables and gauge transformations. II. Comm. Math. Phys. **15**, 173–200 (1969)

[17] Doplicher, S., Longo, R.: Standard and split inclusions of von Neumann algebras. Invent. Math. **75**, 493–536 (1984)

[18] Doplicher, S., Roberts, J.E.: Why there is a field algebra with a compact gauge group describing the superselection structure in particle physics. Comm. Math. Phys. **131**, 51–107 (1990)

[19] Fewster, C.J.: Quantum energy inequalities and local covariance. II. Categorical formulation. Gen. Relativity Gravitation **39**, 1855–1890 (2007)

[20] Fewster, C.J.: On the notion of 'the same physics in all spacetimes'. In: F. Finster, O. Müller, M. Nardmann, J. Tolksdorf, E. Zeidler (eds.) Quantum Field Theory and Gravity. Conceptual and mathematical advances in the search for a unified framework. Birkhäuser (2012). arXiv:1105.6202

[21] Fewster, C.J., Olum, K.D., Pfenning, M.J.: Averaged null energy condition in spacetimes with boundaries. Phys. Rev. **D75**, 025007 (2007)

[22] Fewster, C.J., Pfenning, M.J.: Quantum energy inequalities and local covariance. I: Globally hyperbolic spacetimes. J. Math. Phys. **47**, 082303 (2006)

[23] Fewster, C.J., Verch, R.: Dynamical locality and covariance: What makes a physical theory the same in all spacetimes? arXiv:1106.4785, to appear in Annales H. Poincaré

[24] Fewster, C.J., Verch, R.: Dynamical locality of the free scalar field. arXiv:1109.6732, to appear in Annales H. Poincaré

[25] Fredenhagen, K., Hertel, J.: Local algebras of observables and pointlike localized fields. Comm. Math. Phys. **80**, 555–561 (1981)

[26] Haag, R.: Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1992)

[27] Haag, R., Swieca, J.A.: When does a quantum field theory describe particles? Comm. Math. Phys. **1**, 308–320 (1965)

[28] Hollands, S., Wald, R.M.: Local Wick polynomials and time ordered products of quantum fields in curved spacetime. Commun. Math. Phys. **223**, 289–326 (2001)

[29] Hollands, S., Wald, R.M.: Existence of local covariant time ordered products of quantum fields in curved spacetime. Commun. Math. Phys. **231**, 309–345 (2002)

[30] Reed, M., Simon, B.: Methods of modern mathematical physics. I: Functional Analysis, second edn. Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York (1980)

[31] Sanders, K.: On the Reeh-Schlieder property in curved spacetime. Commun. Math. Phys. **288**, 271–285 (2009)

[32] Stout, L.N.: Dedekind finiteness in topoi. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **49**, 219–225 (1987)

[33] Takesaki, M.: Theory of operator algebras. I, *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 124. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2002)

[34] Verch, R.: A spin-statistics theorem for quantum fields on curved spacetime manifolds in a generally covariant framework. Commun. Math. Phys. **223**, 261–288 (2001)

[35] Verch, R.: Local covariance, renormalization ambiguity, and local thermal equilibrium in cosmology. In: F. Finster, O. Müller, M. Nardmann, J. Tolksdorf, E. Zeidler (eds.) Quantum Field Theory and Gravity. Conceptual and mathematical advances in the search for a unified framework. Birkhäuser (2012). arXiv:1105.6249

[36] Weyl, H.: The classical groups: Their invariants and representations. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (1997)